National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XX. NO. 1. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1859. WHOLE NO. 989.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.
PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, over the Park Bank,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
107 *North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

THE STANDARD.

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Phonographic Report by J. M. W. YERRINTON.

SPEECH OF PARKER PILLSBURY,
Tuesday Morning, May 10th.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is one of the most disagreeable duties of an Abolitionist to have to address a public assembly at its opening session, on his own account; but when he has to stand as a substitute for another, and that other a very desirable advocate, it becomes still more embarrassing and unpleasant. [Rev. A. M. MILLIGAN, of Philadelphia, was expected to make the opening address, but had not arrived at this time.]

I should like to preface the few remarks I have to offer with two additional resolutions:

Resolved, That while we rejoice in all the indications of an advancing state of public opinion against slavery, we would still be mindful that our greatest danger is not from actual slaveholders, and the open, bold and blasphemous defenders and extenders of the institution in State or Church, in politics or pulpit, but rather from those who make specious and strong anti-slavery pretensions and professions, like the Republican party, the Boston American Tract Society, the recently formed New England and New York Church Anti-Slavery Society, the New York *Independent*, with its array of clerical editors and contributors, that are still in governmental or ecclesiastical union and fellowship with slavery and slaveholders.

Resolved, That while these organizations are thus, through their pretensions and professions, able to absorb the awakened public sympathy, control the public charity, paralyze the public conscience, and pervert even well-intended action into channels that flow only with compromise, corruption and crime, it becomes our duty faithfully to rebuke them, and to warn the people against them, as the enemies of that only radical and genuine gospel through which, under God, deliverance can come to the enslaved.

There seems no need to argue or defend propositions so plain as those in the resolutions read. There certainly can be no need of any argument as to the character and quality of the pro-slavery political parties and churches of the country. If there were need of it, Dr. Cheever is far more able than I am to do that work, and quite as ready and willing. But the question is, who shall reprove Dr. Cheever? The question is, who shall examine, illustrate and report upon the character and quality of what we call Anti-Slavery in the Church and in the Government? There certainly is great need of new definitions in our country. The reading of that Belgian protest is very significant in exhibiting the necessity of such definitions. Here is an Address, earnest, sincere, honest, well-meant, in every respect; but it is a very badly directed address. There is a strange and very unfortunate misnomer about it. It is directed to those "*Churches* and *Christians* in the United States who *uphold Slavery*"! (Laughter.) Mr. Chairman, it is time this Society, or some other gathering, should instruct the Christians in Belgium, if they have them there, and in all other parts of the world, on that particular subject. They have no conception of what slavery is. If they understood what it is in our country, and what it is to sustain and uphold it, not to say extend it, they never would address any memorial in that way. We have other evils in our country besides slavery—small in comparison, but still evils. We have horse-stealing, we have robbery of hen-roosts, we have adultery and adulterers, and we have all the details of crime and sin forbidden or condemned in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount; but how would a petition, or remonstrance, look, coming from Great Britain or from the Continent, addressed "to those Christians and Christian Churches of the United States that uphold horse-stealing"?—"to those Christians and Christian Churches in the United States that uphold adultery and fornication"?—"to those Christians and Christian Churches in the United States that rob hen-roosts or establish and institute the robbing of hen-roosts"? If the people of those countries understood slavery to be as bad as the robbing of hen-roosts, they would not charge our Christians and Christian Churches with it. They would conceive it in bad taste to do so, and would not do it, for that reason, if for no other. Here we have slavery. We talk about it as "the sum of all villanies," but "villany" has come to be so moderate a term in our country that "the sum of all villanies" is not much to be ashamed of. We have slavery—an unutterable, indescribable abomination. Language breaks down when we attempt to describe it. Every other sin in the land pales into innocence when you speak of slavery; and yet, there is such a mistaken conception of its character, in every country of the civilized world, that it is really supposed and believed that *Christians* may honestly uphold and extend the institution. Now, I think we must have new definitions of Christian and Christianity, of the Church and of Ministers, of the Gospel, and all those technical religious terms. Let the whole vocabulary be changed, or else let us make it understood that slavery is a thing so utterly horrible and atrocious in its character and in its quality that no one can even presume it possible that Christians can hold slaves.

But, then, we must not wonder that the Belgian Churches make that mistake, for in our country the same difficulty exists. We have just had formed in Massachusetts a "Church Anti-Slavery Association." It is made up entirely of ministers and members of *evangelical* Churches. There was assumed to be a necessity for it, on the part of those under whose auspices it was formed, because, as they said, there was no Church organization bearing a testimony against slavery. They summoned all the spirit and energy they could arouse in the Churches of New England and New York, and there gathered in the City of Worcester some fifty ministers and members of the various evangelical denominations in the six New England States and the State of New York. I suppose, if there be any preference in our religious anti-slavery professions and pretensions, it should be allowed to that body; that if there be any *best* to it, that is the best of it. And yet, what do we find? They could not agree in denouncing slavery as a sin of any such magnitude as to involve slaveholders universally, and went so far as absolutely to affirm it as their belief that slaveholders might be Christians! Now, then, if not only New and Old School General Assemblies, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the American Tract Society, and the American Bible Society, and all the great popular ecclesiastical institutions and associations of our country, if not only *these* avow the doctrine that slavery is so mild, so gentle, so innocent an institution that even slaveholders may be Christians, but if, in addition to that, the very Church Anti-Slavery Society itself—the only one existing in the land—also affirms the same doctrine, then what wonder is it, I say, that the Belgian Churches and the Churches of Great Britain should make the same mistake, and believe that even the "sum of all villanies" is, after all, so light an offence that the very sacramental host of God's elect may practise it, without any impeachment of their Christian character?

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that it is partly our fault that such a mistake exists. I am afraid it is partly the fault of our association, in according so much of anti-slavery fidelity and character to these spurious institutions and associations of our country, that this terrible mistake has been made all over the civilized world; and I came to this meeting with the hope that we should be able to do something to correct that mistake. I do not care anything about the American Tract Society; Dr. Cheever can take care of that. I do not care anything about the American Bible Society; the New York *Independent* is watching that. I care very little about the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Old School or New School; almost the whole of New England Orthodoxy condemns them. But my difficulty is, to so shape and so qualify the anti-slavery enterprise, that Christians (if they have that commodity in Great Britain and the Old World) may not make the mistake which those of Belgium appear to have made. I do not think it is for us to be particular about unmasking the American Tract Society, nor any of those large popular associations to which I have referred; but there is a necessity that we discriminate between true and false—betwixt that which is real and that which is only apparent—betwixt that which is a specious sham and that which is a stern and almighty reality; and we never shall do it until we take the institutions and associations mentioned in those resolutions which I read to the meeting, and class them where they belong—on the side of the oppressor, heart and hand.

It does not follow that we must consequently brand every man in those institutions as at heart a slaveholder, but it is absolutely necessary that we make slavery so bateful and so horrible that the instincts of universal humanity will condemn it, and never dream that it is possible that a man can be a slaveholder and yet be a Christian. We have had scenes of a fearful character, of late, in Washington, and elsewhere; and I suppose no one would ever think it possible that Daniel E. Sickles could be a Christian, or his murdered victim much of a saint, or his wife, still living, any better than Mary Magdalen, after her conversion. But what is all that is terrible connected with those individuals compared with slavery? If every black Sickles in the South, whose bed and marriage rights have been invaded, could avenge his wrong in the same terrible manner, what a Golgotha, what a field of blood would not the whole South present to our view? (Applause.) And yet, we are to believe that the institution which multiplies that Washington tragedy ten thousand times ten thousand fold is not so accursed but that men may be partakers in its guilt and yet be Christians!

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, have got tired of these mistakes. I fear I have had something to do with the authorship of them. I, too, have expressed my approbation of the position and the preaching of men like Dr. Cheever and Henry Ward Beecher; but yet, the vilest slave-breeder and slave-driver in all the land is not vile enough to induce those men to withdraw Christian fellowship and communion from him. Mr. President, what shall we think of it? Do you wish me, or does this Society wish me, to extend the right hand of anti-slavery fellowship to men who, however bold and faithful their denunciations against slavery, will yet clasp, in Christian brotherhood, the right hand of the murderous slaveholder of the South?

Now, I think one thing further ought to be said. The men for whom apology would oftenest be made—those good Christian men referred to in the Belgian protest, and by the Church Anti-Slavery Association recently formed in Worcester—the men in whose behalf exceptions are made—I have no doubt are the most guilty men of all; for the institution would crumble to pieces by its own rottenness if it were only cemented by such depravities as the hearts and hands of "Simon Legrees"—would it not? It is your "Shelbys" and "St. Clairs" who perpetuate the slave system; those men to whom Dr. Cheever gives the right hand of Christian fellowship. What can a "Simon Legree" do to perpetuate slavery? What can the miserable slave-breeder, who boasts that his beautiful females are soon to become mothers, himself the father of their children, do for the system? What can those men do who offer a reward of $25 for the best specimen of an imported MALE African, as was done, not long since, by an agricultural society in one of the counties of Georgia? Can anything be more clear, Mr. President, than that such men rain down odium on the institution? Why, the very electricity of their damning depravity would dash it in pieces were it not for the lightning rods reared in its defence by your "Shelbys" and "St. Clairs" (loud applause). And then, Dr. Cheever, and Ward Beecher, and the New York *Independent*, must extend to them the right hand of Christian fellowship, and the American Anti-Slavery Society must acknowledge them as real religious, Christian anti-slavery preachers and men! I comprehend not such logic.

I fear, Mr. President, that "judgment must begin at the house of God" in this matter, and that it is we ourselves who have yet to repent. When we shall have made slavery the atrocity that it is, and shall have denied to slaveholders and their abettors all right and claim to be considered other than thieves, adulterers and robbers, and when we shall have classed our Church Anti-Slavery Society and Boston American Tract Society with them, as they choose to class themselves, we shall at least have washed our hands from all participation in that guilt. And that is of more consequence than any other work we can ever do. "He that is not for us is against us," was the doctrine on Judea's plains eighteen hundred years ago. I do not believe that philosophy will ever change. Where is Henry Ward Beecher to-day? Where will he be to-morrow? Though entreated and besought to come to our platform and give his testimony in behalf of the anti-slavery movement, we see him not. But when that corrupt, conservative and absolutely criminal Tract Society invites him to its platform, he makes haste to comply. To-morrow, you must go there to hear him.

Mr. Chairman, I must bring my remarks to a speedy close, for my own sake as well as for yours, and for that of the audience. But one word in regard to the political aspect of the present movement. The resolution refers to the Republican party; and there, again, I think, we have labored under a great mistake. That the party comprises men, multitudes of men, whose hearts are right in the sight of God, I have no doubt, but the resolution affirms the truth in regard to them, that their sympathies, their purposes, their consciences, their acts, are all perverted, in consequence of the false and corrupt leadership of that party. When Stephen Arnold Douglas made his first speech apparently evidencing his defection from the Democratic party, I was much struck with the attentive ear that the Republican press and party of the North gave him; and though, only a few months before, they had absolutely corrupted the English language with their new terms of execration in regard to him and his position, that single speech seemed to be as effective as the prayer of the thief on the cross, and they made haste to exclaim to Stephen Arnold Douglas, "To-day shalt thou be with us in our political paradise." At the very next meeting I addressed, I said that Stephen A. Douglas would be the next Presidental candidate of the Republican party. Of course, they hissed me furiously; but then, I was so used to that, I mistook it for their natural language (laughter and applause). However, I said then, "Perhaps that is too strong; but if not Douglas, it will be a strictly Douglas man." Here, I think, I was a little wrong. I do not like to make confessions, but I have to sometimes; for it has come to pass already that they have dropped nearly all non-slaveholding candidates, and the question with the party now is, which of a clique of slaveholders they shall select as their standard-bearer in the next Presidential campaign. Last Friday morning, the New York *Tribune* said editorially, and fortified it with any amount of circumlocution and amplification, that to-day there is no issue whatever between the Democratic and Republican parties involving the question of slavery, except it be the reopening of the African slave trade, and on that question the Democratic party has not avowed an opinion. You may read it, any of you, in last Friday's *Tribune*. I know no other authority better than the New York *Tribune*, and I suppose that statement is true. Well, there was a whole column of comments in *The Tribune* on a letter of Mr. Bates, of Missouri. The Massachusetts Republican papers have published the letter of Mr. Bates, or extracts from it, and they affirm—at least, one of them has affirmed—that if Mr. Bates is brought forward by Missouri in the next Republican Convention, with the promise that the State of Missouri will support him in the canvass, his claims cannot well be set aside. That is what the Republican press generally has said, so far as it has spoken, of Mr. Bates, and *The Tribune* has said even worse, but I have not time to read it. But I will read what Mr. Bates said:

"As to the negro question—I have always thought and often declared, in speech and in print, that it is a pestilent question [that is what the Republican party generally begin to think], the agitation of which has never done good to any party, section or class, and never can do good, unless it be accounted good to stir up the angry passions of men, and exasperate the increasing jealousy of sections, and by those bad means foist some unfit men into office, and keep some fit men out. It is a sensitive question, into whose dangerous vortex it is quite possible for good men to be drawn unawares. But when I see a man, at the South or the North, of mature age, and some experience, persist in urging the question, after the sorrowful experience of the last few years, I can attribute his conduct to no higher motive than personal ambition and sectional prejudice."

That is Mr. Bates, and here is a whole column of *The Tribune*, editorial, in apology for that man!

Well, the other day I saw, among other names mentioned as possible candidates for the Republican party, the name of Mr. Botts, of Virginia. He, too, has written a letter, and here is what he has said:

"My position on the question of slavery is this, and, so far from wishing to conceal it, I desire it should be known to all. Muzzles were made for dogs and not for men, and no press and no party can put a muzzle on my mouth, so long as I value my freedom. I make bold, then, to proclaim that I am no slavery propagandist."

He is, like Mr. Fremont, no "slavery propagandist." There is capital enough, you see, to set a man up as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States by the Republican party. But hear him a word further:

"I will resort to all proper remedies to protect and defend slavery where it exists [just like Mr. Seward there]; but I will neither assist in nor encourage any attempt to force it upon a reluctant people anywhere, and still less will I justify the use of the military power of the country to establish it in any of the Territories."

Good Fremont doctrine; good Republican sentiment. But there is one further remark, which I am afraid the parties who have mentioned his name did not read. He says:

"If it finds its way there by legislative means, it is all well; but never by force, through any instrumentality of mine. [That is what *The Tribune* says: if they want slavery in Kansas, let them have it.] I am myself a slaveholder, and all the property my children have in the world is slave property, inherited from their mother; and he who undertakes to connect my name, or my opinions, with Abolitionists, is either a knave or a fool, and not unfrequently both. And this is the only answer I have to make to them."

Mr. Chairman, I read these passages merely to show the probability, inasmuch as we have it now from *The Tribune* itself, that there is no issue between the Democratic and Republican parties at the present time involving the question of slavery, that not Stephen A. Douglas, as I said, but some slaveholder, whose property is in slaves, and the property of whose children is in slaves, will be selected as the next standard-bearer of the Republican party.

Now, then, I think the same mistake that we have made in regard to the Church, in regard to Dr. Cheever, and those other institutions and individuals whose names I mentioned, we have also made in regard to politics, and that we are absolutely strengthening the hands of our enemies, and at our own expense, when we make it; until it bas come to this now, that the Republican party turns round and reproaches the Anti-Slavery Society for its non-efficiency in the anti-slavery cause. They have exceeded, transcended, outdone us, so they say. They have accomplished all that we ever proposed to accomplish, and have done a great deal more that we did not dream of doing. When I hear Republicans talk in that way of the Anti-Slavery Society, especially of the American Society, with its Executive Committee, its editors, its organs, and other appliances, I am reminded of the anecdote of an old slave in Virginia, who constituted the mate and all hands of a craft that plied up and down one of the rivers or bays of that State, with its cargo of onions and other vegetables, in which that State sometimes finds occasion to deal when it is not wholly confined to the breeding of slaves. The captain was the owner of the craft. The slave's name was Mopus; but the latter syllable was generally dropped, and then it was "Mope"—and a pretty expressive name, too. One night, the captain, having been beating about in rough weather for some time, and feeling quite tired out, as the night was clear, and the north star very conspicuous in the heavens, thought he would trust old Mopus with the helm and turn in and go to sleep. So he called Mopus to him to give him his directions, and told him to steer directly for the north star, and then went below and turned in. Well, old Mopus kept the schooner straight very well for a time, until by and by it occurred to him that he might as well smoke his pipe, and so he went to work to light it. While he was doing this, a breeze sprung up, the sail began to flap, he became a little confused, and before he had fully recovered his self-possession, the vessel had wheeled right about, and was making straight for Point Comfort, from whence they had started. By and by the captain woke up, and, on going upon deck, saw that the schooner was headed the wrong way, and began to swear at old Mopus, and ask him what he had been about. Said he, "Didn't I tell you to steer for the north star? and here you have been running with it right astern." "Oh, yes," said Mopus, "gorry, massa, we passed the north star about an hour ago" (laughter). So it is with the Republican party; it has absolutely passed the north star, toward which it pointed in its beginning, and fancies that, while sailing directly back to slaveholders, slavery, and compromises with slavery, it is absolutely making the voyage successfully and prosperously (applause).

Mr. Chairman, how long shall we allow the people, through any lack on our part, to be thus deceived? Who will undeceive the Churches of Belgium and of Great Britain? Who will undeceive the partially enlightened and partially repentant Democrats, and rescue them from such perversion of well-intended action, as is all action in the Republican party?

I have already exhausted my time and the little strength I have. I will simply say this, in closing, that if we shall, at this Anniversary, succeed in drawing such a line of distinction between Slavery and Anti-Slavery that there shall be no such mistakes made hereafter, in Great Britain, in Belgium, and even in our own country, as we now see are common and everywhere occurring, I fancy we shall have held the most important and most profitable Anti-Slavery anniversary ever held since our enterprise was first set on foot (loud applause).

A gentleman rose among the audience, and took exception to Mr. Pillsbury's remark, that Dr. Cheever would fellowship the vilest slaveholder in the South. He said he had himself left the Church with which he had been connected for twenty years, to identify himself with Dr. Cheever, when he was assailed by enemies without and foes within because he had said that "slaveholders were guilty of murder, and, had they lived under the Jewish dispensation, would, every one of them, have been hung." He said there was not a word of truth in Mr. Pillsbury's statement, and that, if he had known the sentiments of Dr. Cheever, he would not have dared to stand up before a New York audience and say he was in full fellowship with slaveholders (applause).

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.—A business meeting of the Society was held at the Committee-room adjoining the City Assembly Rooms, at 2 1-2 o'clock, the President of the Society being in the chair.

The published Report of the Executive Committee, for the years ending May, 1857, and May, 1858, was presented, and distributed among the members of the Society.

AARON M. POWELL, of Ghent, and SAMUEL MAY, JR., of Boston, were appointed Secretaries *pro tem.* of the Annual Meeting.

OLIVER JOHNSON brought before the meeting the subject of the Society's organ, THE STANDARD, and the question as to the best way of extending its circulation.

On this subject, the following persons spoke: OLIVER JOHNSON, SUSAN B. ANTHONY, ANDREW T. FOSS, PARKER PILLSBURY, J. MILLER MCKIM, AARON M. POWELL, SAMUEL MAY, JR., WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Rev. GEORGE B. ASK, THEODORE TILTON; the discussion was of great interest, the testimonies to the great value of THE STANDARD were unanimous, and various methods of increasing its circulation were suggested and considered.

The Chair, according to vote of the Society, nominated Committees on Business, on Nomination of Officers, and on Finance, as follows:

Committee on Business—Wendell Phillips, Lucretia Mott, J. Miller McKim, Francis Jackson, Charles C. Burleigh, Parker Pillsbury, Aaron M. Powell, Charles Lenox Remond, Oliver Johnson, Antoinette Brown Blackwell.

Committee to Nominate Officers—Edmund Quincy, Edward M. Davis, Joseph Post, Robert Purvis, Joseph Carpenter, Lydia Mott, Pliny Sexton, Andrew T. Foss, Clark Greenman, Adeline H. Howland.

Committee on Finance—Rowland Johnson, New York; Susan B. Anthony, Rochester; Lydia Mott, Albany; Aaron M. Powell, Ghent; Joseph A. Howland, Worcester.

Mr. GARRISON spoke of the work most needing now to be done by the Society—which work, he said, was with the Northern States, not with the Southern. He instanced several points where this work is greatly demanded.

ANDREW T. FOSS responded cordially to the views and suggestions of Mr. Garrison.

AARON M. POWELL took the same view. All these speakers advocated active and energetic measures in all the Northern States for the enactment of laws prohibiting slave hunting and catching—for the abolition of all laws proscribing the colored population, subjecting them to any special burden, or depriving them, or their children, of any of their rights, in regard to schools, the elective franchise, &c. &c.

WENDELL PHILLIPS thought that if the right man could be found to take in charge an increased circulation of THE STANDARD, a man experienced in such business, the means to sustain him could be found.

CHARLES L. REMOND advised to have one or more special additional agents appointed to work in our principal cities. He alluded to the proscriptive rules towards the colored people prevailing in the omnibuses and avenue cars of this city generally, and thought that a special agency might very properly be instituted to convert the city of New York to common humanity and decency on the subject.

Adjourned to 7-12 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.—The President called the Convention to order at 7 1-2 o'clock. The audience, considering the extreme inclemency of the weather, was large, and the attention and manifest interest encouraging.

Rev. A. M. MILLIGAN, of the Covenanter Church, Pennsylvania, was the first speaker. He said:

SPEECH OF REV. A. M. MILLIGAN.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE: I come before you this evening, to cast my mite in aid of the cause of Liberty and Humanity. This is not a mere political gathering, not a mere squabble for the emoluments of office; if it were, I had not been on this platform to-night. The cause for which we have come together is not merely a cause affecting the rights and liberties of four millions of colored people, but affecting the rights and liberties of twenty millions of white men, composing this great nation, and affecting the destiny of the untold millions who are hereafter to people this great, new country. While one man wears a chain, no man can be entirely free. This fact of the enslavement of a portion of our citizens is already making its mark very sensibly upon the masses of the inhabitants of this country, as is manifest in the imprisonment, in the "City of Brotherly Love," in the dungeons of Moyamensing, of an individual of pure white extraction, for having declared, to one of those who had none to plead her rights, that by the laws of Pennsylvania she was free; in the fact that around the Court-house in the city of Boston chains are drawn, and ruthless hands drag back to bondage, from a reluctant people, a man who had cast off his fetters, and sought refuge and protection beneath the shadow of Bunker Hill; in the fact of the trial of twenty most respectable citizens of Ohio for having snatched from the hands of the kidnapper a man who, by his own noble achievements, had earned for himself freedom; in the outrages in Kansas, and in the fact that if an anti-slavery man preaches "deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound," within the limits of this professed free Republic, he must do it at the risk of his life.

The struggle which is now going on, the agitation which exists in our country, is not the work of a few fanatical men; it is the outgoing of a great principle; it is the life-struggle of a great truth, whose birth was in eternity, and the womb of whose conception was the bosom of the Eternal. The sound which we hear is the deep rumbling of the volcanic fires enkindled in the great heart of the community. The principles of this great struggle underlie all the relations of man to his fellow-man, and the creature to his Creator. It is a fact that he who strikes at the subject, invades the sovereignty of the sovereign; that he who attacks the sovereign assails all his subjects. There is a bond of connection between those in authority and those under authority, that identifies them, so that he who touches one of them touches the apple of the eye of him who rules over them; and hence those who assail the rights of the feeblest citizen strike at the very foundations of government; and he who touches one of those who are Christ's subjects, touches the apple of His eye; and hence they not only levy war upon humanity, but also upon God, as He is the Sovereign of the universe, as He is the Creator of man, and it is by Him that man is endowed with those noble and inalienable rights which He is bound to support. This principle is very clearly, and in language almost inspired, presented in the great declaration of this nation's independence. It is there declared that man is endowed with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; that those rights are not only privileges belonging to man, but that they are privileges conferred upon him by that Being who created him; that they are birth-right privileges, guaranteed to him by his Creator, and that he is to be defended in their enjoyment by Him who has given him those rights. This principle is also very clearly and fully expressed in the whole Word of God. The first great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength and with all thy mind"; and the second is like unto it, namely, this—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Upon these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." That is the declaration of Him who spoke through those inspired prophets; that is the declaration of Him who gave that law; and we must come to one or the other of two conclusions, either that the Word of God is inconsistent with itself, and a tissue of fictions, or that the whole Word of God is in consistency with those two commandments which require man to love his neighbor as himself, and to honor and serve his God. Hence the question which is properly before those who are vindicating the right of the slave is two-fold, and yet really but one. It is a question which respects the rights of God in the first place, and the rights of man in the second place. The great moral arch cannot be invaded in one of its parts without marring and destroying the whole.

The early settlers of this country were heirs to the great principles of liberty, civil and religious. In the early history of the colonies, when met together in solemn assembly, they considered the documents prepared by the great Westminister Assembly, and declared that, with very few exceptions, they endorsed and adopted them; and that without any exception, they endorsed and adopted the solemn League and Covenant of England, Scotland and Ireland. Hence, we find, in their Declaration of Independence, the great principle stated at the outset, that man derives his rights from God, and we find the colonists, when engaged in their struggle for independence, placing their reliance upon the God of battles in the maintenance of their liberties. The character, however, of this nation very early underwent a change. That people who had hurled down the gauntlet of defiance at the feet of the tyrants of the world—that people who had called upon their colored brethren to aid them in their struggle for liberty, with the promise that they should be sharers in the boon—that people very soon forgot their indebtedness to God, and their indebtedness to those who had shed their blood as freely as they had shed theirs in defence of the liberties of the country; and only twelve years later, they changed very materially their government, which had been established in dependence upon God and ascribing honor to His name. That was the age when infidelity was prevalent in France, and from France had found its way to this country, which had been aided by France in achieving its liberties. The nation had attained a name and position among the people of the earth; they began to anticipate for themselves great things; they began to dream of a great and powerful government, that should gather in all the nations of the earth; and, in order that they might make a platform on which the Mahomedan, the Pagan, the Jew, the slaveholder, and all, of whatever character, might stand, they entered into a compact, they framed an instrument from which not only is the name of God and the name of the Son of God omitted, but the law of God was dishonored and degraded from its high place as the supreme rule of man's conduct, and another code substituted in its place, which is in direct conflict with that eternal law of the Eternal Lawgiver. The rights of God are respected and the rights of man guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence; the rights of man, and the rights of God, in the Constitution, are equally withheld. And hence, while we are carrying on this battle, while we are waging this war upon the stronghold of the enemy, it becomes us to remember all the points of assault, and, in an especial manner, all the help upon which we may properly expect to lean; and while we are calling upon man to rouse himself, and exert the faculties which God has given him, and to defend the privileges which God has guaranteed to him, let us call upon God to rouse himself in his might, for His foes are raging, and come to the rescue of His own prerogatives and the rescue of His own subjects.

The Word of God is a sword. It is a weapon that has been mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strongholds of sin and of Satan, but that weapon, like all the weapons of the Christian's warfare, is mighty peculiarly through God, and, as the apostle directs, should be used with all prayer and supplication. The Word of God is a power, but that power is only felt in all its potency when it is applied by the Spirit which indited the Scriptures; and hence it becomes us, in engaging in this conflict, to take up our arms in God's name, to fight the battles of the Lord while we are fighting the battles of the people, and depend upon Him who alone can give success and effect to the cause in which we are engaged.

That there was a revolution in the sentiments of this nation, that that revolution was manifested and clearly displayed in that instrument which is the bond of our nation's compact, is evident from the fact that, from the adoption of that instrument, the course of the country has been materially changed. Up to that day, slavery in many of the States was dying out; from that day, slavery has increased in strength, until it has become a power in the government, and by that power it has gone forward with giant strides, aiming at and vigorously aspiring to a universal supremacy in the land. In that Constitution, there is a compact between the several States, by which they are not only bound together in general terms mutually to aid and sustain each other, in which they not only guarantee to each other certain rights and privileges, but a compact in which there is a distinct stipulation giving to the slaveholder political power in proportion to the number of human beings whom he holds in bondage. In it there is a guarantee given by every State of the Union that they will return to his servitude the flying fugitive from bondage; that they will suppress domestic insurrections; that they will resist foreign invasions, and that they will protect from domestic violence those who stand with their feet upon the necks of the bondmen. In this compact, then, there is, distinctly and manifestly, a pledge of all the States in this great Union to hold the slave in bondage, so long as his master chooses to claim the guarantee given to him by that compact. To this compact, every officer of the government must bind his soul in a solemn vow ere he can enter upon his office; to this compact, every foreigner must declare his allegiance before he can be admitted to citizenship; and to this compact every native born citizen must lend his influence, and, through his representative, give his oath-bound pledge, ere he can enjoy the God-given right of the elective franchise; thus securing to the slaveholders not only the pledge of the States, not only the pledge of the officers of government, Federal and State, but the pledge of every citizen who chooses to avail himself of the rights of citizenship, and take part in the formation of the laws under which he is to live; and so every citizen is, by this iniquitous scheme, bound to the support of the atrocious system of slavery, and is himself a slave.

Mr. Milligan then reviewed the progress of the anti-slavery movement from its inception up to the present hour, and said that, in view of the wonderful change in public sentiment upon this question, the friends of the slave had cause to thank God and take courage. He had so large a charity upon this subject, or perhaps was so anxious to count friends to this cause, that he was willing to extend a welcome and a word of cheer to all who had undertaken, in whatever form, the advocacy of this great principle, and who were found, at whatever stage of progress, laboring for this great truth. An army did not consist all of generals, or of riflemen, or cavalry, but each, in its place, under proper leaders, was capable of doing good execution; so, in this great warfare, they had need of all kinds of soldiers. He had no doubt that the platform on which he stood was the honored platform of this great principle; that it was, at least, one of the witnesses in this great cause, one of the standard-bearers in this great army; and he believed that from the testimony offered here, the other advocates of the rights of the slave and the cause of humanity had borrowed their thunder, and learned their alphabet (applause). But he desired to enumerate among the friends of the cause not only the great American Anti-Slavery Society—great, not so much, perhaps, in its numbers, as great in its principles, and great in its integrity and unflinching zeal in the cause—but to place side by side with that Society another body, perhaps more obscure, but not less zealous, in some respects, in this great cause, with which he had the honor to be identified, and also that great party, which, although it had forgotten, to a great extent, the object for which it was started, had yet done much to enlighten the community upon this subject, and reached a class of minds that could not be reached from that platform. While he charged every individual who swore to support the iniquitous Constitution of the United States with being *particeps criminis* in the crime of slavery, there was, nevertheless, in their action, a gain to the great cause. So also of the Churches. Some Churches had taken steps in the right direction, feeble though they might be, and he was willing to give them credit for it, although they were not willing to cut loose from the ecclesiastical organizations and from the Constitution.

The Abolitionists had to thank the slave-owners for doing the greater part of the work that had been accomplished, for he saw, in the repeated acts of aggression of the Slave Power, the hand of God, causing the slaveholder himself to break the chain and unbind the yoke with which he had been oppressing his victim. When he looked back and saw the progress that had been made, and saw, on every hand, new friends of the cause springing up, he felt that they had reason to thank God and take courage—to "set up an Ebenezer, and say, Hitherto hath the Lord helped us."

In looking forward to the future of this struggle, said Mr. M., there can be, in the mind of every thinking man, no hesitation or doubt as to the actual result. If a cause be of God, you cannot overturn it; and if ever any cause demonstrated itself to be the cause of God, this cause has so demonstrated itself. In looking at the struggle in which we are engaged, I admit that only one feature has been prominently brought forward. I admit that our attention has been directed mainly, if not entirely, to the influence of this institution, and to the influence of this government, upon the rights of man; but, at the same time, when its end shall have been accomplished, when the "good time coming," which we have been expecting, shall have fully come, there will be so plain and potent a manifestation of the operation of God in the work that men will see and acknowledge His hand, and say, "God has done great things for us"; so that that feature, which has not been prominently brought forward in the beginning, will be the great and crowning triumph in the end (applause).

Mr. M. then alluded to the struggle for liberty which seems to be close at hand in the old world, and inquired if the children of revolutionary patriots in this land should allow their liberties to be trampled upon, and allow four millions of the brotherhood of man to be crushed beneath the weight of a most unrelenting and accursed bondage, and remain supinely on their backs without moving in the great struggle. He would ask if the aggressions of the Slave Power had not been sufficiently grievous and oppressive? Did it need that any more of their citizens should be imprisoned?—should they wait until any more blood be spilt?—or should they imitate the example of their noble forefathers, and enter into the struggle? It was not necessary that they should take up the sword, for the North had only to speak out, and give expression to her moral sentiment, and the destruction of slavery was accomplished. He called upon every true-hearted American to rise for his country. He called upon every Christian, every lover of his God, to strike for his altar. He called upon every friend of free speech, a free press and a free pulpit, and a free religion, to give utterance to a voice of protest that shall make the tyrant tremble in his seat, and make the chains to fall from the shackled and the oppressed (loud applause).

In conclusion, Mr. Milligan said—My last word is, to thank the Executive Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society for giving me the opportunity of uttering my thought upon this free platform. I feel that they have conferred upon me a very high honor. I feel that this platform is an historical one. I feel that the men who are acting here to-day are enacting history, and I leave it to posterity to write that history and seal the record. And while Doctors of Divinity are shaking their heads, while faint-hearted friends are expressing their fears, I call upon the community to give it to the winds, to photograph it upon the canopy of heaven, to take a pen of iron, with the point of a diamond, and write it upon the rocks forever, that a member of the Old School Covenanter Church—a class of people who are known to have a spinal column, a back-bone, that will not bend to flattery nor bow to power—has stood upon their platform, has given his assent to their testimony against the black institution of this land, against the Constitution, which has given it strength and vitality, against the administration of the government that has gone beyond the Constitution to impose this sin upon the Territories, against the Churches which have given it their sanction and their plaudits, and against all those who are in any way concerned in holding millions of their fellow-men in bondage (applause).

Mr. GARRISON—The Anti-Slavery platform affords the largest liberty of expression on the part of every one standing upon it. Our respected friend, Mr. Milligan, has given us the view of the constitutional compact as it has always been understood and interpreted by this nation, binding North and South together in one bond, whereby slavery is made possible, and its perpetuation as sure as anything can be. Our friend, Judge Culver, who is to follow him, I understand may give us a different view of the question, as it lies in his own mind, so that we shall have both sides of the constitutional question presented. But I will not anticipate: "he is of age, and can speak for himself."

Judge CULVER was greeted with hearty applause as he took the platform. He said:

SPEECH OF HON. E. D. CULVER.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Herein is your liberality commended beyond any Society that holds its anniversary the present week in this city, that you have invited to your platform one who has never been identified with you in your mode of action. Nay, more, you have invited one who has long been known as identified with another organization, operating in a different field of labor; one that has performed service, for twenty long years, in the Whig party, officiated at its birth, and performed funeral ceremonies at its death (laughter and applause); and one who has lately been identified with another organization, sometimes termed the "Black Republican" (renewed applause).

Now, friends, I was urgently invited to attend another meeting this evening; but I felt that it was due to you, who, knowing my position as a public man, had invited me, as a public man, upon this platform, to come here. I preferred to do it, as I had never had the pleasure of addressing an audience gathered under the auspices of this Society before. Seven years ago, I undertook to do so, but, somehow or other, they mistook me for one of you, and clattered me down (laughter). But times have changed; and now, if a third of a century, almost, of hard labor, consistent labor, to say the least, entitles a man to be known as a consistent man, I may lay claim to that title. Although I have not acted with you, I have had my eye upon the same object. I have honored you that you dared, under all circumstances, in all places, to avow your sentiments, just as you believed them. I felt, when I listened to what was called a Garrisonian Abolitionist, just as we used to feel in Congress. We would sit and hear John C. Calhoun, and differ from him in almost every line he uttered; but we were satisfied that he said what he thought. That is the difference. We love to hear men who we think believe what they say, and say what they believe.

Now, as I suppose I am limited to thirty minutes, I have a few words to offer, not directly in the attitude that was suggested by the worthy chairman, but to pre

sent a few scattered thoughts upon that vast question which seems to trouble me more, perhaps, than it does most of you—I mean the judicial aspect of the slavery question. You understand perfectly well, friends, that there have been some monstrous strides taken, during the last four or five years, in this matter. Now, on this constitutional question, there is what I call the new view and the old view, and I want to say a word upon each one of these.

You understand what the new view is. We have had it announced, by high authority, that there seem to have been just two paramount objects in view at the formation of the Constitution: one was to make a market for cotton, and the other to catch "niggers." It has been announced from the Executive chair that there is in the Constitution something that takes slavery wherever it goes, by its own strength; and that when the Constitution goes to a Territory, slavery goes with it, until interdicted by positive State law. And hence you remember the Chief Executive of these United States declared that Kansas was as much a slave State or Territory as South Carolina; and the reason assigned was because the Constitution sanctioned and guaranteed property in slaves. Now, that was followed up very close and probably uttered in the same connection with that remarkable decision called the Dred Scott decision; and if you will run your eye over that decision, you will see that five, at least, out of the nine Judges put it upon the ground that the Constitution recognized property in slaves and guaranteed the right to hold slaves; that slavery went where the Constitution went; and they take the astounding ground—astounding to the people of the United States—that neither Congress nor yet the people of a Territory can intervene in behalf of freedom, and prohibit the introduction of slavery. That is the new view of this question; and, in harmony with that, see what has been done. And, friends, let me say that in Ohio, in Massachusetts, men can be tried, convicted and condemned for doing a Christian act. In South Carolina and Georgia they cannot be convicted of piracy itself (sensation). How is the law expounded in those States? It is said that the jury may take the law and the facts in their own hands. The lawyers get up and gravely argue that the law against the slave trade is an unconstitutional law, and that it is for the jury to decide upon the law as well as the facts. The jury understand it well; they take the hint quickly, they pronounce it unconstitutional, and declare that it is right to get slaves from Africa. But in Ohio and Massachusetts, altogether another view is presented—that the Judge gives the law, not the jury; and hence the man who performs a Christian act of nobleness, benevolence, charity and kindness can be convicted, because the law is given to the jury, and they will take the law as given to them, by the Court. I allude to this to show just one thing—the tone and tendency of things in our country now, under the present judicial aspect of this question of slavery.

Then there is another great question involved in this matter—the Lemmon slave case. Let me stop for a moment to tell you how that case originated, for I had a personal connection with that matter. It is now nearly six years since, one day, news came suddenly to my office that there were eight slaves down in a Dutch grocery near the Battery, who, the next day, were to be exported to Texas. There was no time to be lost, and our fingers flew nimbly, I assure you. We obtained a writ of habeas corpus, and I took an officer and we went down to the place. As we opened the door, we saw two colored women and three or four children. They were badly frightened. My officer was a brute—a Democratic constable (laughter)—and he went up and said to them, "D—n you, get up! What are you doing here?" I saw they were terrified, and I told him, if he spoke another word to one of those women, I would send him off and get another officer. I went round to one of the women and said, "Nancy, don't you be afraid; we are your friends; we are going to take you to the City Hall, and give you your freedom." I shall never forget the look of that woman while I live on this earth (loud applause). She got up, and took her youngest child in her arms, and the others followed. She straightened up straight as a Connecticut rolling-pin (laughter), and walked right up to the City Hall. There we tusselled the question fifty-six hours, and then they were declared free. We had a carriage at the door; they were put into it, and were soon beyond the reach of the slave-hunters (applause). Well, the State of Virginia felt that her dignity had been insulted, and she raised five thousand dollars to pay Jonathan Lemmon, and then, in addition, she appealed from the decision of the court. We succeeded before the general term, with a full bench, and shall succeed before the Court of Appeals; but we shall fail when the case goes before the Supreme Court of the United States. They have told us in advance what they mean to do in the Lemmon case. They are anxious to get it, and dispose of it. The principle involved is precisely this: that the State of New York, having made a law providing that persons brought into the State, for the purpose of being taken out of it as slaves, shall, by virtue of that fact, be made free, she has acted unconstitutionally, and had no right to pass such a law. We must understand that State rights do not mean now what they used to mean. I speak of it as showing the tendency downward, all the way through.

But is there not another view of the question? Is there not something to be said in favor of the Constitution? And you will allow me to say as many good things as I can of it—not to defend it as a whole, because it needs patching in certain places, I admit (applause). Were these the only objects for which the Constitution was framed, to sell cotton and catch "niggers"? If that instrument did read, as Buchanan and Judge Taney would have us believe, that, "in order to extend the blessings of slavery and catch negroes that are running away, we ordain and establish this Constitution," I should sit down speechless, and admit that you had the argument on your side. But, thanks to the noble men who framed that instrument, there are some other objects declared. It is due to them to say that they had taken fresh draughts from the fountain of liberty, and they would not admit the word "slavery" or "slaveholder" into the Constitution.

Now, let us see if the Constitution does not declare objects a little better than those proclaimed by Judge Taney. "In order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and *secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity*, we ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." In harmony with that, look and see what the Constitution says, and see whether you can find anything in it that would afford any substantial prop to slavery. On the other hand, is there not a great deal in it in favor of liberty, and, incidentally, do you not find evidence that its founders intended that it should operate in favor of freedom and not slavery? You find that one man, who took a prominent part in the formation of that Constitution, in 1784 brought in a bill to sweep slavery out of every inch of territory then owned by the United States, which failed at that time, but was revived, in 1787, and carried through, and all the North-West territories made free. Now, when it is affirmed that neither Congress nor the people can intervene to restrict slavery, where is the authority? When the government first started, how did the men who administered it understand the power of Congress in this matter? There were sixteen acts of Congress, approved by nine consecutive Presidents, eight of them slaveholders, by which Congress undertook to legislate upon, restrict, modify, and in many cases absolutely interdict, the very existence of slavery in the Territories. Now, tell me, with all that weight of authority on the other side, what you think of the doctrine of James Buchanan and the entire Democratic party.

Let me look one moment further at this argument, that slavery is recognized by the Constitution—that is, recognized in the sense to sanction, support and guarantee—for that is Mr. Buchanan's argument. Now, does the Constitution establish or guarantee the right of property in slaves? Is the guarantee there? If it is, where? when? how? Judge Taney says there are but two places in the Constitution where slavery is alluded to. There are but three in it that, by implication or inference, embrace the subject, directly, of slavery. Look at them.

"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."

Now, mark! "The migration or importation of such *persons*." Did we not need a law something like that, that the States should not be laying a tax upon Turks or Jews brought in here? The importation or emigration of "such persons," whether they came from Turkey, or Holland, or France, or Germany, or Spain, or from Africa or Asia, was not to be prohibited previous to a certain year. Tell me not the fathers meant to put in there what is assumed to be there by James Buchanan and Judge Taney!

Now, look at the other:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

Give me a Judge on the bench who will put a proper definition on the term "due," and I am sure the devil will get his "due" very quick! (Laughter and applause.) What is there in that clause that recognizes property in slaves? Did we not want a clause in the Constitution in just those very words? Was there not a man in the Convention who wanted to introduce the word "servitude," and did they not refuse to make the change? Was there not need for such a clause, so that if an apprentice, bound to a man in Connecticut, runs away to New Jersey, and the master comes after him from Connecticut to New Jersey, he cannot be discharged, but may be "delivered up"? If my son, not yet twenty-one years old, runs away from me, and I want to reclaim him, I can go after him, and take him home. He owes me "service or labor"; and so with the indented apprentice. I admit that, under that clause, the judiciary says that the slave escaping from his master may be reclaimed and taken back; not because he is property, but because he is a "person." But that is a judicial interpretation.

Now, these two clauses were wanted. There is nothing in them that implies the idea of property in slaves. Is there anything in them that allows the existence of slavery, even?

There is a third, and the only other one—namely, that relating to the ratio of representation. In fixing the ratio of representation, that ratio is to be determined by taking the "whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed," and then adding "three-fifths of all other persons." That word "other," I admit, by a fair construction, implies that there are some persons in the country not "free persons," not Indians untaxed, not persons bound to service. It implies the bare existence of such a state of things. Is there any sanction of it? Can it be claimed that there is such a recognition as makes a guarantee of the thing? I utterly deny it. Let us see what it does prove. Does it not simply say this: that a locality that has any such persons, besides free persons, Indians not taxed, and persons bound to service, shall lose two-fifths of the representation to which they would otherwise be entitled? Is that an endorsement of the system? It is an endorsement by a blow "over the left." It is a thrust at it—it is a penalty. I would as soon say that the Bible takes polygamy with it wherever it goes, because it recognizes its existence, as to say that that Constitution carries slavery with it wherever it goes. The Bible shows the fact of the existence of polygamy, and its writers were recording facts, not writing out morals, at that early day. When you turn to the New Testament, you find that Paul says of a bishop that he must be the husband of one wife. Is not that an intimation that a man who is not a bishop may have more than one wife? Brigham Young says, "Yes." I say, "No"—he was describing a qualification. Slavery recognized by the Constitution, because in one place it simply admits an existing fact, and cuts it off with a three-fifths representation! I remember an anecdote of a man who, on his return from Paris, told his friends that the Emperor Napoleon had recognized him in the street. "How did he recognize you?" "He told me to stand aside, or he would kick me out of the way" (laughter). He *did* recognize him. You might as well tell me that your City Council cannot pass a law interfering with a man's right to property in dogs, because the Legislature of the State have recognized property in dogs, as to say that the Legislature cannot interfere with slavery, because the Constitution recognizes its existence. Your State law is to your City Council what the Constitution is to the Legislature. But how does the Legislature recognize property in dogs? Simply by declaring that when a man owns two dogs, he shall pay a tax upon one of them! (Laughter.) But I deny that there is a guarantee of the right of property in dogs, so that the City Council cannot interfere with them. No man will contend that there is.

Now, what do we want, most of all? We want some honest Judges. I can fancy in my mind men sitting on that bench who would dispose of slavery in short order. If we could call Judge Mansfield there as Chief Justice, and place the venerable John Jay on his right, and that devoted friend of humanity, lately deceased, William Jay, of Westchester, upon his left, and then have an Attorney-General like Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts (applause), or that noble philanthropist, Alvan Stewart, do you not think they would find a way of settling this matter? They have made me a Judge over in Brooklyn, and one night a man was brought before me in chains, who, in three days, was to be sent back to South Carolina. We did not do anything contrary to law. The papers were made out pretty quick, to be sure, but they were all right; and before the morning sun streaked the east, he was travelling towards Montreal, where he arrived in safety, and is doing well (applause).

You see things about that Constitution that you would like to have changed, or a new Constitution entirely. I wish to see the experiment tried, and, with the success of the Republican party, I hope to see it (applause). In 1852, the Whig party deceased, because the last vestige of anti-slavery went out of that party, and its day of doom had come. Do not talk now about who that party should have nominated, in order to have been successful in that election; its day of doom had come; and I fancy that whoever the Democratic party shall nominate in 1860, its day has come. Give me an administration with its great leaders in favor of humanity, give me a Court that shall lean to the principles of the early days, and I think I can see a way whereby slavery may become a poor, weak, gaunt ghost in a short time.

Now, friends, we must admit that Mr. Giddings expressed a great deal of truth about you, when he said, "Let these women have a hearing, for they are the ones who generate the steam that drives the anti-slavery car"; but let me say, kindly, do not press too hard against Dr. Cheever; stand by him; he has taken a bold step in the right direction. Do not waste too much of your strength upon Henry Ward Beecher. If he does not appear upon your platform, you know what his heart is, and you know how many thousands of ears he gets access to that you do not (applause). Do not be too severe upon the Republican party. You are the friends of the colored man. When we touch the great question of the wrongs and outrages of the negro race (I have felt it often in my public addresses), there are certain classes of men who will turn up their noses, so that our politicians have to march with muffled drums when they touch upon that subject. It does me good to come into an organization where people dare to speak right out for the colored man. God knows my heart bleeds for him when I see what is done in other States against this poor and despised race—oppressed here, cast out there, shut out from all the avenues of business, and deprived of every motive to endeavor. I honor you for being the consistent friends of the colored race. Go on, friends, in your noble work, and God be with you and speed you in the right! (Loud applause.)

EDWARD GILBERT, Esq., of this city, was then introduced. He said:

SPEECH OF EDWARD GILBERT, ESQ.

I feel that it is with rather an ill grace that I come upon this platform, after the stirring speech to which you have just listened. I feel as though I had nothing to say. The first speaker this evening seems to have stolen the first part of the thunder of my speech, and the last speaker the latter. My speech will therefore be very short and very dull. I do not know, in fact, why I was invited to come upon this platform, unless because I was known to be connected with the Church Anti-Slavery Society; and as these people are known to be great sticklers for the Church (applause), it may not be inappropriate to make some remarks upon the theories upon which this Society is based, as politics and theology have been used up.

It is not necessary, in speaking of this Society, to make a definition of slavery, or to depict its enormities. You have all the facts and figures and arguments, and if it is not necessary to go over them; but yet there is, on this occasion, something that would lead me to wish to penetrate into the cause of this thing, to get at the core of it, and, if possible, the remedy for it; to look so minutely into this matter as to contrive some remedy for the evil, and some plan for putting the remedy in operation. In every disease, there must be not only the discovery of the remedy, but the application of that remedy. Now, then, what is this disease? Where is it? Why, we seem to be assembled at the North, away from the evil, and without any very close connection with it, as we stand in this hall, in the City of New York, and talk about the evil as away off South. What is our relation to it, and what our responsibilities?

Suppose that slavery existed in the British islands and America were free; does any one doubt that the slavery question would be made the staple of discussion at every political meeting, that every pulpit and platform orator would exhaust himself in denunciation of it, and the pyrotechnics of declamation flash forth in every hall over the glory of America and the shame of England? There is no doubt about it. Should we say, then, we have no responsibility—the responsibility belongs to England? Yet now we say nothing, and still we assert that we have no responsibility. Now we are altogether mute, and yet we say we are not partners to this shame at all. How shall we account for this public sentiment? We know that the fact exists, that every anti-slavery movement is an unpopular movement. If not, why is it that the orators who declare the denunciations of the Almighty against the sin of holding men in bondage are persecuted? Why is it that thousands of clergymen are sent off into the rural districts on the ground of their anti-slavery abstractions? There is but one answer to these questions—it is because the people feel their responsibility—nothing else; and I submit that, all through the North, there is a feeling of responsibility on this very subject; and that is the reason why the matter cannot be touched without persecution. There is no doubt about it at all.

Now, then, what is the nature of the demand made by the colored people of this country? Is it like the demand made by an oppressed people just ready for recoil upon the oppressor? Is it like the demand made by Lafayette and Kosciusko at one time? Not at all. If it were, we might get the cooperation of thousands; everywhere, all over the world, men would join in the movement. But the slave is very poor, very low, very degraded, and seems to be an outcast. There is nothing in his case which stirs the mass of the people. It is an appeal made directly to their benevolence and their sense of duty. Consequently I affirm, as a logical conclusion, that any effort that is made for the alleviation of the condition of the slave will be a religious movement purely; it can be nothing else. We cannot say we will resort to arms in order to release the slave. That is never best, until there is no other resource left. The North have not done their duty. They have made concessions and compromises where they should not have made them. They have conceded and compromised until the Constitution is assumed by the South to be a pro-slavery document; and therefore Northern Abolitionists, taking it according to its interpretation, say it is "a league with death and a covenant with hell." It is a pro-slavery document, as interpreted, no doubt of it; but I long to see the time when this question shall be discussed all over the country, before the people and by the people, and when it shall be decided by the people whether or not it is a pro-slavery document. If it is, then I say, let it go; if it is not, then we will assume it to be for freedom, and use it to accomplish the purposes of freedom.

Now, Mr. President, if this is a religious movement, we have no right to let go one single facility for operation which chance has thrown in our way. If the Constitution is an anti-slavery document, if it was made for freedom and not for slavery, we are bound not to let it go. I recollect a very good anecdote told of a Methodist missionary, who went among the Pacific islands to convert the savages there. Some one asked how he got along with them. He said they were very wild, and he could do nothing by the common method, and, having exhausted that process, he resorted to another. He would select one, give chase, catch him, throw him down, hold him there until he had converted him, and then take another; and in that way he managed to convert nearly the whole of them (laughter). Now, then, the Constitution is the bond that holds North and South together. We cannot go there to preach, but the preaching can be done here in New York, and all through the North, and, under certain circumstances, we can hold the South fast.

Mr. Gilbert here illustrated his point by likening the North and South to two ships, grappled together for the purpose of sustaining liberty and spreading the star-spangled banner more freely to the breeze. If, after awhile, a conspiracy should be entered into in the hold of one of the ships to let go the commission under which they first set sail and run up the black flag of piracy, he wanted to know whether the first impulse of a brave and bold commander would be to cut loose from the mutinous ship or to let the grapnals remain, board the other ship, and put down the conspiracy. He maintained that the North had no right to entertain the idea of disunion; that if the South wanted to cut loose, the North should say, "We will not let the Union go; we will hold you fast, as the missionary held the savage, until he had brought him over" (applause).

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH then took the platform. He said he did not intend to occupy much of the time of the meeting, but desired to glance very briefly at some of the points which had been presented by the preceding speakers. When the people felt as they ought to feel in regard to slavery, and in regard to their duty to the slave, there would be no more running away to Montreal by men who had been legally declared free. With much that had been said respecting the Constitution, he entirely agreed. That it had been stretched by pro-slavery judges beyond the intent and purposes of those who framed and adopted it, he had not a shadow of doubt; but he had understood his friend (Judge Culver) to admit that there was a compromise or agreement by which the one party agreed to stand by the wrong-doing of another party, up to a certain point. He had said that he should not attempt to defend it as a whole, but only to put a patch on here and there, where it would bear patching, so that the new cloth put on an old garment should not make the rent a great deal worse than it was before (applause).

In regard to the illustration used by Mr. Gilbert, Mr. B. said his objection was that he supposed the parties to start on a laudable voyage in the beginning, without any admixture of piracy; whereas he maintained that, when the Union was launched, that piracy was a part of the original intent of the voyage, a part of the very compact by which the North and the South were grappled together. It was agreed—incidentally, if they pleased—that somehow, to a certain extent, when the black flag was run up, they would all be parties to the piracy together.

Judge Culver had said, give him such Judges as he could name, and then they would see if something could not be made out of the Constitution to operate against slavery. Let him, said Mr. Burleigh, raise the spirits of the dead, and place them on the bench, crowding Judge Taney from it to make them places, and then we will see whether the Constitution can be legally and reasonably interpreted so as to be freed from the taint of countenancing this piracy in which one of the parties insists upon being engaged. But I apprehend he will find it easier to call up Lord Mansfield, and John Jay, and William Jay, and seat them in noble array before us, than to evoke from that Constitution the evil spirit of oppression that has been in it ever since it has been made (loud applause). He had one question to ask of his friends who said that the Constitution was originally free from the taint of complicity with slaveholding, that it was put there by interpretation, and not by the framers and adopters of the instrument, and that was, How came it to get there at all? How came it to be there from the beginning? How came it that, in 1793, a statute was enacted by Congress for the recapture of fugitive slaves? How came it that, from that day to this, it had always been interpreted, by legislatures, by judges, by lawyers, and by the usages of the people, as containing clauses for the protection of slavery, to a certain extent? It was to be remembered that the Constitution was the work not alone of those who framed it, but of the people who adopted it. If the people had wanted an anti-slavery Constitution, clearly, thoroughly, decidedly anti-slavery, they had wit enough to say so, and in language so plain that they would not misunderstand their own work, and interpret that work in a way different from that which was originally intended. The very fact that the makers of the Constitution have interpreted it to be a pro-slavery instrument proves that they meant it to be so.

Having this evidence of what the Constitution was meant to be, the Abolitionists regarded the original compact as having the taint of piracy in it, and that was the reason why they chose rather to cut the grappling irons than to keep on in the prosecution of a piratical voyage. Moreover, just as long as the two vessels continued to grapple together, the South would contrive, by one stratagem or another, to keep command of the vessel; they would contrive to furnish the helmsman at the wheel, the pilot on the quarter-deck, the captain and the mate; and if the North would only consent to serve as the crew, that was all they cared about. They regarded us as very good hands, provided we did not mutiny; and if we did, there was the Supreme Court on one side and the army on the other to crush us as between the upper and the nether millstone.

Their doctrine, then, was "No union with slaveholders" (applause); the maintenance of the sanctity of the free soil of the North, so that as soon as a human foot stepped upon it, it should be the foot of a freeman (loud applause). Their doctrine was that there should be no need for a man to go to Canada in order that he might be free. They meant to take the Canada line and move it down to the borders of Maryland and Virginia, and then to South Carolina, and then to the Mississippi. They meant that the battle of freedom should be fought on Southern soil at last, and, in order that it might be, they meant first to purify the Northern soil from all stain of slavery and complicity with slaveholding. They meant to get a firm foundation here, where their feet would not slip, and then they would battle with the demon of oppression on his own ground. Only let them feel that the ground was firm under their feet, and that where they stood they should not slide, and they would give one strong push, and hurl the monster into the Mexican Gulf, to a death that shall know no resurrection (loud applause).

Mr. GARRISON—Our respected friend has invoked the shades of John Jay and William Jay, and has expressed the desire that they might reappear, and pronounce judgment upon this question. If they should reappear, it would not be to take his ground, for John Jay never doubted a word we utter upon the pro-slavery compromises of the Constitution, and William Jay never once denied any one of the pro-slavery features of the Constitution—the slave representation in Congress, the right of the slaveholder to hunt his slave on Northern soil, and the duty of the North to protect the slaveholder in case of insurrection; so that, if they could reappear, it would be simply to reindorse all that we affirm, and disprove everything he has said.

Then he wants us to be very kind in regard to the Republican party. We will be just as kind as we can, of course, for we desire to be at peace with all men, if possible. "*As much as is possible*," says the apostle, "live peaceably with all men." But when our friend can induce the Republican party to take his ground, to go into the next Presidential campaign and on its banner proclaim the Constitution to be an anti-slavery Constitution, and, if that party be triumphant, the Constitution be so interpreted and enforced, we will be so kind to that party that I think we shall consent to ground our arms and have no further controversy with it. But while it refuses to do any such thing, while it is ready to support the pro-slavery compromises, as they have ever been understood by this nation since the adoption of the Constitution, and while the party is every day lowering its standard, in order to make victory possible, not for the sake of victory, but for the sake of the spoils—the loaves and fishes of office—I humbly submit that it is not the time to ask us to be specially kind even to the Republican party. At the same time, our work is to deal with that party honestly, fairly, as we deal with the Democratic party, and all other parties. Recognizing any issue, anywhere, which is really against slavery, at its true value, we will still adhere to the principle of "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS," and will still maintain that it is impossible, for God or man to form a union between tyrants and freemen, between free institutions and slave institutions, but that they are eternally hostile to each other, and one or the other must bite the dust. Recognizing that simple fact, the incongruity of such institutions, and the eternal antagonisms of such elements in the land, we avow ourselves to be on the side of freedom, therefore are we for cutting loose from the slave system of our country, or the Southern portion thereof, because they are determined, as one man, to make slavery eternal on our soil.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the position of the American Anti-Slavery Society is the only one which can maintain a successful warfare upon the slave system; for I think my friend Judge Culver will readily admit that an anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution would at once be met by the entire South as an usurpation and fraud, not to be submitted to for a moment, and the dissolution of the Union will as assuredly be brought about by his interpretation, with a bloody process attending it, as it will be by our calling upon the people of the North to cut the connection for conscience' sake, in order that we ourselves may be clear of the blood of those in bondage, and that the death-blow may thereby be given to the system.

Loud calls were then made for Mr. PHILLIPS, who came forward and spoke for a few moments, with clearness and power, on the constitutional question, in reply to Judge Culver.

CHARLES LENOX REMOND said he thought he saw a slight inconsistency in the argument of Judge Culver. He had counselled them to look and act as well as feel kindly towards the Republican movement, and, almost in the same breath, had given them to understand that he honored the American Society for its fidelity to the colored man. It seemed to him that if he had read and heard aright, the Republican party had not only disfranchised, in some sections of your country, the colored man, but had ignored them in other portions of it, and, as a general proposition, they had repudiated the colored race, by claiming for the Republican movement that it is a party for *white* men. If that party repudiated the rights of the colored man, and this Society should be honored for its fidelity to him, he would like to inquire of the Judge how the two could walk together?

The Convention then, at 10 p. m., adjourned, to meet on Wednesday morning, at 10 o'clock.

SECOND DAY.

The meeting was called to order, at 10 1-2 o'clock on Wednesday morning, by the President. The weather continued exceedingly unpleasant, and the audience was, consequently, not so large as could have been wished.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., of Leicester, Mass., read the following Address to the citizens of Warrington, England, in response to the one read yesterday to the Convention:

ADDRESS

FROM THE AMERICAN ANTI SLAVERY SOCIETY, IN TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING ASSEMBLED,

TO THE CITIZENS OF WARRINGTON (ENGLAND),

Who, to the number of three thousand five hundred persons, of all ranks and classes, including the Mayor, the Rector of the parish, and the Member of Parliament for the Borough, have united for the aid of this Society in an appeal to the citizens of the United States to relinquish Slavery forever.

With inexpressible gratitude—with feelings which cannot even be imagined except by such as know by experience the horrors of slavery and the toil and difficulty attendant on its abolition—the American Anti-Slavery Society acknowledges to have received, by the hand of its President, Mr. Garrison, as forwarded by Mr. Robson, an address, of which the comprehensive brevity and fidelity to the deepest and highest laws of man's existence make it fit to be engraved on every human heart. It is therefore certain to prove of potent influence with the American people to whom it is addressed; and we embrace this earliest occasion to assure our honored coadjutors in Warrington and its vicinity of the good it has done already, as published in our anti-slavery journals, by cheering and encouraging ourselves, and of the good it is sure to accomplish by its fraternal and deferential commendation to our fellow-citizens of the only course in regard to slavery which a good citizen can pursue. We know by manifold tokens, as well as by their assurance to the contrary, how deep is the impression made upon our people by the public opinion of other lands, especially of the mother country.

Not only to us and to our oppressed clients, and to our beloved native land, is such action as these high-minded Englishmen have taken eminently beneficial. If sufficiently multiplied, such addresses will awaken, inform, concentrate and direct the anti-slavery spirit of their own country, so as effectually to prevent those dishonorable diplomatic sacrifices of liberty which a timid English Ministry, in doubt of home support, feels compelled to make to the demands of our slaveholding Cabinets and the menaces of our slaveholding Congresses.

Thus this action of the just and generous public heart of WARRINGTON is felt by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY as the first stroke of a new and prevailing diplomacy, whereby the complications created by the trickery of European cabinets and the bullying of American slaveholders shall be forthwith stopped.

But, while rejoicing in this prospect, it becomes us, gentlemen and friends, to thank you with no common sense of grateful obligation for the pecuniary part of your testimonial. Supposing it to be for the most part composed of very small donations, we dare affirm of this combined power of gift and testimony that (if you will allow us the phrascology of our Puritan fathers) you shall not have gone over *half* the cities of your Israel before this work of abolishing slavery shall have been accomplished.

While, as the treasurers of this noble enterprise, worthy of a world's profoundest interest and most energetic action, we can accept your welcome gift without any feeling of humiliation, we *do* feel humbled at the thought that, although so much has been accomplished in awakening the people, such donations should be yet needed in our native land.

Believe, meanwhile, that you are not aiding a body of persons in the accomplishment of this common good who have ever spared any sacrifice on their own part, pecuniary or other, by which they might hope to promote it: from the moment when foreign moral stimulus shall enable us to awaken in our own land a more general devotedness adequate to the occasion, we shall be the first to decline pecuniary aid from yours; and may that day be close at hand!

We accompany this address with a selection of our recent publications; and when you learn from them where the cause now labors, and the means we are putting in operation to carry it forward, we think you will be gratefully surprised as we are at the felicitous inspiration which prompted the righteous deed at the right time.

Done at New York, by order of the American Anti-Slavery Society, May 11th, 1859.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *President.*

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, *Corresponding Sec'y.*

WENDELL PHILLIPS, *Recording Sec'y.*

The Address was adopted, and the Convention voted that it be transmitted to the citizens of Warrington.

Mr. MAY also read an extract of a letter from a lady who is travelling with Rev. THEODORE PARKER, giving an account of the state of his health, and also of the results of emancipation in the island of Santa Cruz.

Mr. REMOND then presented the case of a colored woman among the audience who was endeavoring to purchase one of her children, in bondage at the South. He said he understood the woman to be of excellent character, and, although he did not, as a general thing, approve of the purchase of slaves, yet this was one of those cases which he could not find it in his heart to oppose. He hoped she would receive not only sympathy, but cooperation.

Rev. SAMUEL LONGFELLOW then addressed the Convention. He said the preceding speaker (Mr. Remond) had presented, in a single image, the reason why they had assembled together. It was because, in this land, to-day, a woman was in the hands of the slaveholder, ready to be made merchandise, and worse than merchandise, with all her powers of womanhood, and all the powers of her body, made a curse to her; and she only one of millions in the same position, in the fearful and wicked power of slavery. He felt that those who came there, on a stormy day like that, were the most likely to be the old friends of the slave and his cause, to whom he could have little to say, to whom he could tell nothing that they did not know, in whom he could hope to inspire no enthusiasm that they did not already feel. And yet some might have stayed in, even that morning, who would want to know why they were gathered there, and making so much trouble and agitation about the slave. To these, it might be enough to say that slavery exists, and they were men, and therefore they could not but be agitated by the existence of slavery, slavery being what it is. Slavery met them everywhere; they could not open a newspaper but some form of terrible wrong and suffering confronted them, and they were not stocks and stones, but men and women, he hoped, and had hearts that must feel, and consciences that must be moved to indignation. It was because slavery existed, and such enormities as had already sprung from the system would continue to grow out of it while it existed, that they were moved, that they were indignant, that they agitated, that they lifted up their voices and put forth their hands to do what they might. It was because the Slave Power was at work, not only at the South, but in the States that call themselves free. It was because New York was not free, but the slave-hunter could pursue and seize his poor fugitive chattel upon her soil. It was because, in that very city, the man who had just spoken to them (Mr. Remond) was driven from his seat in a car, because he was a colored man. A drunken white man might be permitted to ride by the side of their mothers and sisters, while a respectable colored man was to be expelled from his seat!

Mr. Longfellow then proceeded to inquire what could be done to remove this great sin and shame of our land? The first thing to be done was to tell the truth about it, for there was nothing that oppression and crime so much dreaded as the truth. He thought very much might be done to aid those in the Southern States who are not slaveholders, but, from one reason or another, hostile to slavery. When he was in Cincinnati, a year ago, he went to the jail to see a young man who was confined there, a prisoner with felons, because he had done a simple act of common humanity, and allowed his rooms to be used by a man and woman who had escaped from slavery in Kentucky. It was not to be forgotten that it was a crime, to-day, in the eyes of the law, to do an act of nobleness and humanity and high virtue in the sight of God and of true men. In conversation with this young man, he had expressed the opinion that there were many at the South who were willing to read publications on the subject of slavery, and that much could be done by the circulation of such publications in that section of the country. He (Mr. L.) was glad to see that a movement had been made to distribute through the South a work which, with unanswerable arguments, facts and figures, would show men the unprofitableness of slavery. That was one argument against it. They would all be glad if emancipation should come through the high moral instincts of men, rejecting wrong, injustice and cruelty; but they would gladly avail themselves of any means by which men might be induced to get rid of the evil, even though they did not yet see it as a sin.

He thought another way by which they might influence hostility to slavery was by encouraging the plan for colonizing, by free men, the Southern slave States—for it was from them that slavery must first disappear. When the first slave State is emancipated, the spell would be broken, and others would follow. Slavery would retreat again and again, but at last, in its stronghold, he was afraid there would be no way by which it could be overcome but by blood. This was not a pleasant thing to look forward to; it was a course to be most sincerely deprecated. He did not believe in gaining any rights, even, by so unrighteous a means as the taking of the life of a fellow-man; but the world believed in it, and he never should blame the black man if, having read the history of our early days and of the much lauded men of those times, he should go and do likewise; if he, too, should implore the aid of the God of battles, and assert his God-given right to be a freeman.

Here at the North, much could be done by consistently and persistently bearing their testimony, and declaring that there was no such thing as rightful ownership in man; that it is always a crime against God and humanity for one man to claim to be the owner of another man; and also by helping those who have escaped from bondage and surrounding them with a public sentiment that should make them secure here, and not oblige them to fly to Canada for safety and protection. Then they could cheer each other and encourage themselves by holding on to the great principles of faith, and, every now and then, as God gave them opportunity, putting their principles into some form of action, and thus give greater strength to their faith in freedom, their faith in that liberty the love of which and the faith in which, though once baptized in blood, have been fast dying out in our land.

Friends, said Mr. L., there is something we can all do, only let us have faith, and let us be earnest, and let us trust our own hearts and consciences against every sophistry of him who would persuade us that we have nothing to do with American slavery.

Dr. W. C. GOULD said he had been in the habit of attending these Conventions for about twenty years, as opportunity offered, and had sometimes heard remarks made from that platform which he thought calculated to discourage the moderate wing of the anti-slavery party, to which, perhaps, he ought to consider himself as belonging. He thought that injustice was done, yesterday, in the remarks made by Mr. Pillsbury and Mr. Phillips in regard to Dr. Cheever and Henry Ward Beecher, and that the vast amount of good which those men were doing for the cause was underrated. If it were true, as was sometimes said, that the Abolitionists bore the burden and heat of the day, and stood in the front rank of the opponents of slavery, was it not also true that the rear rank filled the vacancies that were made in the front rank, and furnished the moral support without which the front rank might find itself faltering? The moderate portion of the anti-slavery men had labored hard and sacrificed much for the cause; and if it had not been for them, God only could tell how many of their noble Parker Pillsburys and Stephen Fosters would have dangled in mid air. It seemed to him proper to compare the anti-slavery Church of to-day with the primitive Church of the apostolic age, and he understood the apostle to compare the members of that Church with the members of the human body. Some are compared to the hand, some to the feet, some to the eye, some to the ear. If all were eyes, where would be the hearing; or if all were ears, where would be the sight? The Parkers and Pillsburys and Fosters were needed, but the Beechers and Cheevers were also needed. Was it not better that George B. Cheever should stay away five or ten years, and then bring with him his tens of thousands of recruits, than come to-day single-handed and alone? (Applause.) Was it not a fact that Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. Cheever had had, and were having, access to thousands and tens of thousands, who were ready to give them an attentive ear, but who would not listen to their noble friend Pillsbury, or their eloquent friend Phillips?

Mr. GARRISON—I would beg leave to say, in regard to the remarks of our friend, that nothing has fallen from the lips of any one on this platform in derogation of any anti-slavery act done by those gentlemen. I believe the criticism has had reference to the pro-slavery position still occupied by Mr. Beecher and Dr. Cheever; and I think it is always legitimate, on the anti-slavery platform, to criticize a pro-slavery position (applause). It is not to exhibit an uncharitable spirit, but fidelity to the slave. I understood this to be the sole issue made with those gentlemen yesterday. As for standing aloof from this platform, in order that they may marshal a mighty host ultimately to come along with them, I do not believe in it (applause); and I am very sure that if Dr. Cheever is faithful to the anti-slavery principles which he enunciates, and will not compromise them at all, he will find that he must come to this platform, and he cannot bring but a very few with him at first (applause); but if he will lose his life for this cause's sake, he shall find it; if he will consent to forego the number that our friend supposes he may rally to his side, provided he turns his back upon us, I think in that act he will do such a work for those in bondage as he never can do in any other way. But I would not have Dr. Cheever come until he is prepared in spirit to come; and that he may be prepared, we must criticize him; we must show him wherein he is still in the wrong; giving him all possible credit for his noble utterances and for what he has dared to do up to a certain point, but still telling him that one thing is lacking—that he has not severed the connection whereby he gives a religious sanction to slaveholding in the persons of slaveholders, who are recognized as Christians, and with whom he sits down to the communion-table as brethren in the Lord. This is the issue that we make with our friend, not, of course, complaining of any genuine anti-slavery word or act that he may have uttered or done, but only showing him that he has yet a higher position to reach, if he means to be true and faithful to those in bondage (applause).

Mr. May, in behalf of the Finance Committee, then made an earnest appeal for funds, alluding to the urgent need that existed for labor in fields already whitening to the harvest, and expressing the hope that the friends of the cause would give as liberally as their means allowed.

JAMES MILLER MCKIM, of Philadelphia, was the next speaker. He said:

SPEECH OF J. MILLER M'KIM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our anti-slavery enterprise stands justified before all right-thinking men, not only by the good it is competent to do, but by the results it has already accomplished.

In saying this, I do not forget that slavery has not been abolished in a single State since our enterprise was launched; nor that, on the contrary, two more slave States and a vast extent of slave territory have, since that time, been added to the Union. Nor am I unmindful that never before have the slaveholders been bolder or apparently more determined in their efforts to build up their system than they are at this moment. Nor do I overlook the fact that many reputed wise men believe that our movement can do no good, and that many more so-called good men declare that it has already done much harm. I still affirm that the anti-slavery enterprise may, without arrogance, claim the homage of all sound-minded people on the ground of what it has already accomplished.

Clarkson, in his history of the abolition of the slave trade by the British Parliament, notices certain collateral benefits as having accrued to England from the long agitation which preceded that event. It improved—he gives us to understand—the tone of the nation's morals, elevated the character of her statesmanship, purified her religion, and gave her people more just ideas of human rights and human duties. Seen from Clarkson's point of view, these were the incidents, the abolition of the slave traffic the end, of that protracted effort. Seen from our standpoint, the incid

a change has come over the spirit of our dream. The incubus which set so heavily upon our breast has wakened and recalled us to our senses. Subserviency to slavery is no longer a passport to public favor in Pennsylvania. Our delegation to the next Congress comprises a larger number of able, slavery-hating men than has ever before represented us at Washington. Pennsylvania is no longer safe hunting-ground for the slave-catcher. The Methodist class-leader Gorsuch tried it, some years ago, and lost his life. The attorney of Mrs. French Simpson tried it, the other day, and lost his money. Daniel Webster, not the "god-like," was put on trial for his liberty The tribunal was one of the Slave Power's own appointment. The case lasted for four days, during which time the people spoke, and in language so loud that it was heard in the court-room, and Daniel Webster was declared to be what the God of nature had made him, a free man. That fact indicates the change which Pennsylvania has undergone on the question of human freedom. It shows how now beat the pulses of her people. It is our petition to the next Legislature for a Personal Liberty bill. It inspires the hope that Pennsylvania will yet be the "keystone" of a prouder arch than that which now spans and supports this pie-bald government.

The change which has taken place in Pennsylvania is manifest in every other free State. Look at Washington when Congress is assembled, and you will see it all indicated as on the dial of a clock. Twenty-one years ago the "old man eloquent" stood for freedom, almost solitary and alone; now a majority of the House of Representatives hold doctrines in advance of those advocated by John Quincy Adams. At that time, when, in the Senate, Henry Clay uttered the blasphemous doctrine that "what the law made property, that was property," and that "two hundred years of legislation had sanctioned and sanctified American slavery," Thomas Morris, of Ohio, was the only man to rise and affront him. Now behold the change! The Senate is an entirely different body. Henry Clay has gone, and Calhoun, and McDuffie, and all the Titans of tyranny, and their place is filled by men of much inferior stature. The talent, the power, the statesmanship of that body is now on the side of the North. Seward and Hale, Sumner and Wilson, Fessenden and Bell, Trumbull and Wade, Harlan and Durkee, are the men who give character to that body and interest to its proceedings. These facts I allude to as proof of the healthful change which public opinion has undergone, through the instrumentality of the anti-slavery enterprise.

In religion, the change, though less easily measured, is none the less striking. Ecclesiastically as well as politically anti-slavery has been a benefactor. It has stripped hypocrisy of its disguise, and divested priestcraft of much of its power for evil. Let me not be misunderstood; I use this language in no sectarian sense. In what I say, I allude to mere professional clergymen; men who live by religion as demagogues do by politics; Protestant as well as Catholic Tetzels who peddle Christianity as a trade and subsist on its profits. I say anti-slavery has done much to strip this class of their factitious power. This is apparent inside of the Churches as well as outside. The great Revival prayer-meetings in Philadelphia, and I believe it is the same elsewhere, are conducted by laymen, merchants and other business men. The clergy are elbowed to one side, unanointed men give out the hymn and pastors follow the people. And these meetings, be it noted, are not held in sectarian temples, of which the people are jealous, but in public halls and such like unconsecrated places, with which abolitionism has made the people familiar. This indicates a change which has taken place since the origin of the anti-slavery movement. To a man who can appreciate the simplicity of the Gospel, and the proper dignity of a true minister, this change will be welcome as a harbinger of coming good.

Our enterprise, Mr. Chairman, commends itself to the approbation of sound-minded people by its influence in raising the condition and enlarging the sphere of woman. In saying this, I have no reference to moot questions of woman's rights which divide the public. I refer to matters in regard to which all are agreed. It is claimed for Christianity, as it now prevails, that it has raised woman to a level above that which had been assigned her by heathenism. This is a fair argument, and an unanswerable one. I claim for the anti-slavery movement that it has raised woman to a place above that which was assigned her by the prevailing Christianity. Nineteen years ago, Mr. Chairman, Gerrit Smith, occupying the chair which you now fill, appointed Miss Abby Kelley, that then was, to a place on one of the Society's committees. This was strongly resisted as indecorous and unscriptural. A schism ensued in the Society. A large body went off and formed an organization which now is not, leaving this Society to struggle against added difficulties with diminished numbers. We survived the struggle, and so did the principle which occasioned it. Since then, State Legislatures, College Faculties, Medical Boards, and other conservators of society, have united to enlarge the circle of woman's activities, and to admit her to a position which, except in rare instances, she never before enjoyed.

The anti-slavery enterprise has ever been the staunch and efficient friend of popular education. It has furnished more teachers for our public schools and select academies than have been supplied from any other source. Years ago, an Education Convention was held in the city of Philadelphia, which was largely attended. It was succeeded by an Anti-Slavery Convention, held in the same building. A friend afterwards remarked that the chief difference between the two bodies was that Horace Mann presided over one and Lindley Coates over the other.

The literature of the country, Mr. Chairman, has been revolutionized by our movement. Anti-slavery publications used to be burned in Charleston and drowned in Philadelphia. Paulding and Park Benjamin, and the like, held sway in the republic of letters. Carey and Hart expurgated Longfellow's poems to increase their profits, and Hildreth and Whittier were only read by such as found their way into the Anti-Slavery office. How changed is everything now. The entire literature of the country—everything that is worthy of the name—is against slavery. Pro-slavery booksellers grow rich on anti-slavery novels, and pandering theatrical managers put money in their purses from Abolition dramas. All the best daily and weekly journals, and monthly and quarterly magazines, are anti-slavery. Whittier and Lowell, Curtis and Harriet Beecher Stowe, are of the class that now furnishes the reading of the American people. The swashy yellow-covered trash which used to furnish the staple of the book trade is superseded, by a literature more worthy of the name. This is true, at least to an encouraging extent; and thanks are due for the same, in a large measure, to the anti-slavery cause.

Our movement also stands commended by what it has done for the free people of color. We have not obliterated the prejudice which oppresses this class of our fellow-men—that cannot be done till slavery is abolished—but we have greatly softened its asperities. We have removed some of the obstacles which stood in their way, and allowed them an opportunity to move forward. The progress they have made is most satisfactory. Twenty-five years ago they were low in the scale of intellectual and moral improvement. Now, included among them are eloquent orators, able writers, well-educated physicians. When the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed, there was hardly a school for colored children in Philadelphia worthy the name. Now there are between twenty and thirty day-schools, besides others, in that city, where all the branches of an English education are taught, from the most elementary upward. I attended an examination of one of these schools last week, and I must say that the proficiency of the scholars, male and female, in mathematics and philosophy, in Latin translation and English composition, was such as would have done no discredit to an institution of higher pretensions.

And the material condition of the colored people shows corresponding advancement. In Philadelphia we have many more men of wealth than we used to have among our colored people. Long rows of handsome three-story brick houses are occupied and owned by colored people. Their children are at school, their more advanced sons and daughters are learning trades. They themselves are adding to their accumulations, by the diligent pursuit of some honest and useful calling.

One more proof of what the anti-slavery enterprise has done, and I shall have done. It has taught the people to put a more rational estimate on the worth of the American Union. Time was when to calculate the value of the Union was to commit, politically, an unpardonable sin. You might call in question anything and everthing in heaven above or the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, but to impeach the "incalculable value" of the Union was a sin which had no forgiveness. In this dogma lay the strength of slavery. It was one of the bastions of the system. For in the name of the Union has every act of pro-slavery villany been perpetrated which has disgraced the country for the last twenty years. The superstitious and unreasoning worship which has been paid to this man-made instrument has been most degrading. It has had its day. Abolitionism has greatly modified it. It has brought the people close up to their obscene god and let them look in its face. They have seen its revolting features. It has taught them to dare to weigh its advantages in the balance of reason. They have done so, and *tekel* is the record of their judgment. What the union of Church and State has been to religion in England, or rather what the Inquisition was to Portugal and Spain, that is the American Union to Freedom and our general prosperity; and yet there are pious people in England who devoutly believe that that country is indebted for what religion it has to its Church establishment; and there have been many devout Catholics in Spain and Portugal who ascribed their religious blessings to the Holy Inquisition. So there are people in this country who think that in the Union we all live and move and have our being; that without it the ships in the New York docks would rot, the ice trade of New England melt away, and the coal mines of Pennsylvania be sealed forever. Mr. Chairman, the practice of the medical faculty, under the old system, used to be to bleed their patients by the quart, blister them by the square foot, and dose them daily with drastic drugs. And what is surprising, their patients often got well! And, what is still more remarkable, they actually believed that their doctors had cured them, and so paid them roundly for their services! Sir, we are political patients under the old system. The Federal Union, like Dr. Sangrado, is drawing our life-blood from us, drenching us at the same time with warm water assurances that it is all for our own good, and we are fools enough to believe and pay for it. Sir, I am happy to be of the opinion that though the fools are not all dead yet, their number, in this respect, is fast diminishing. The people are getting tired of this old mode of treatment. They understand the subject of political pathology better. If they must, for a while longer, take this doctor's stuff, they want it in homœopathic doses. The name of the Union has lost its charm. Its power to conjure and allay the spirit of freedom is gone. In this fact slavery has lost one of its chief reliances, and for this fact the cause of freedom is indebted to the Abolitionists.

These are some of the results accomplished by the anti-slavery enterprise. I might add others equally striking, but it is unnecessary. These are sufficient to prove my position, and I end as I began, by asserting that the anti-slavery enterprize stands justified before the world, not only by the good which it is competent to perform, but by the beneficent results which it has already accomplished.

Mrs. Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, who was received with loud applause, then addressed the audience. She was glad to hear such an encouraging view presented as that given by the last speaker, while yet she admitted the necessity for such watchful and critical censors as arker Pillsbury and others. It was needful that they should be watched over and watch even themselves, so that they should not be so elated with what had been done as to lead them into any compromise or unfaithfulness in regard to what remained to be done. There was still a great deal to do, for the number of slaves in our country had greatly increased since the labors of the Abolitionists began, and they must toil on, toil ever; they must find new paths to walk in, and they would see these continually opening before them. It was not necessary now that they should go over the old ground, and reiterate that which was so needful at the beginning, because the public sentiment had been elevated, and the popular periodicals and newspapers advocate anti-slavery, to a certain extent; but there was always something new to be said; every good Abolitionist, out of the treasures of his heart, could bring forth "things new and old," and thus their meetings were made very interesting.

Mrs. M. said she had just left a large company of women, gathered together to consider the great principles and testimonies of the Quaker Society. Anti-Slavery had occupied their attention a part of the time. This Society, although it did not come strictly into the category of those who were in communion with slaveholders, had yet, owing to the various causes which had operated upon the whole country, been slow to speak out and act out, honestly and faithfully, their anti-slavery principles and sentiments. They had needed laborers among them, as in other Societies, and their labors had not been without their effect. The efforts which had been made in the land had produced a result at which they all rejoiced, giving, as it did, evidence of great gain to the cause.

Mrs. Mott then referred to the importance of adhering to the principle of moral suasion as the most effectual means for the accomplishment of this great work. She hoped they would not lose their faith on this point. They should all remember that they set out on the ground of moral resistance—not merely passive resistance, but resolved to go forth with weapons that were not carnal, but spiritual, and which had proved mighty, through God, as far as they had been wielded, to the pulling down of this stronghold. She believed, if they continued to wield these weapons, they would go on, conquering and to conquer.

Rev. Mr. Noyes, of Hope Chapel Independent Church, was the next speaker. He said he had not expected to speak until the afternoon session, but he had accepted the invitation tendered him but a moment before, without hesitation. The remarks of Dr. Furness yesterday, in reference to the reluctance he once felt to take part in the anti-slavery struggle, had touched his heart deeply, for it was his own experience. But he had given over the struggle, and he thanked God that out of his abundant mercy, he had permitted him to stand on that platform. He felt a stronger and a better man for the privilege (applause).

It was the mission of that Society to stand for the truth, for it was not bayonets, not organizations, that were to revolutionize the world, but the power and sublimity of true ideas. He was a Republican, and deemed it his duty, on all occasions, to cast his vote for that man who represented most nearly the anti-slavery principle; but he was forced to confess that he saw in that party signs of yielding this principle of resistance to slavery, lopping off a little here to suit the American party, and a little there to secure the coöperation of the conservative element in the Northern slave States. He did not find in politicians that faith in man, that faith in God, that faith in truth, which would lead them to do as that Society had done, go forth in the strength of the grand idea of universal liberty, which was the all-conquering power. The Republican party was not leading the people, but holding them back. The sentiments of the people were in advance of the party, and what that Society stood for was to criticize parties and sects, and demand that this principle be kept clear and uncompromised before the people.

He desired to say one word in behalf of the clergy. He knew they were not so outspoken on the question of anti-slavery as was to be desired, but some allowance must be made for the position in which they were placed. Of the forty thousand clergymen in this country, he knew that very many of them would thank God for permission to stand upon that platform, if other influences did not hold them back. They should have the sympathy of the anti-slavery friends, not their reproaches, for, after all, they were the greatest sufferers, who, having the whole truth in their hearts, stood in the pulpit with their tongues tied, or uttered only half the truth.

He was a practical man, and was thankful for what the Republican party had done, and for what Dr. Cheever and Henry Ward Beecher were doing, as far as it went. He had some little trouble about the Constitution of the United States, but, as at present advised, he should vote for the Republican party. He desired to thank them for the privilege of standing there. It was not much to them, but it was a great deal to him.

Mr. N. said he had been much amused at a reference which was made the day before to an article in a Boston paper upon "Infidel Philanthropy." If he were going through an orchard, and should point out a tree full of beautiful fruit, and then say, "What a pity it is that there is no sap in that tree, and that it is so rotten at the core," he thought that would be about as sensible as it was for anybody to say of the members of this Society, who had borne such fruits as they had done, "They are very philanthropic; but, alas! alas! they have no religion, they are infidels and heretics" That was the best Christianity that bore the *fruits* of Christianity.

A gentleman in the audience desired Mr. Noyes to explain how an anti-slavery man could act with the Republican party and not compromise his principles. It seemed to him that he was rowing with one hand and backing water with the other.

Mr. Garrison expressed the hope that, as Mr. Noyes had said he had expected to speak in the afternoon, that expectation would not be disappointed, and then perhaps he would take occasion to reply to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. G. then said he desired to say another word in regard to Dr. Cheever. It was the distinctive characteristic of their movement that it allowed nothing to stand in the way of the deliverance of the slave. Everything was to be tested by that. There was no test so sure, so vital, so comprehensive, as the slave. A man might have the sentiment of anti-slavery in his head and in his heart, and for that sentiment be willing to go some distance, and make considerable sacrifices; but if there was anything dearer to him than the slave, as a man and a brother, he had yet to learn his *whole* duty, and to remember that the *whole* law must be kept. Now, said Mr. G., I know of no man in this country who is speaking such words of power against slavery as Dr. Cheever; no man who is so gifted in the graphic power of delineation as to the horrible enormity of the sin of slavery, and of complicity with it, as Dr. Cheever; but yet, there is something, after all, I apprehend, growing out of his education and position, which is of more importance to him than the slave and his deliverance ("hear, hear"). I will illustrate this by stating that, last May, after the conflict which he had in the Tract Society meeting, when he found himself borne down to the ground, with hardly a solitary man, comparatively, to stand by his side, I ventured to call upon him, to thank him for what he had done in that meeting. Being very anxious to know what he intended to do in the future—for it seemed to me that God had given him an unparalleled opportunity to be the great Luther of our movement, religiously speaking—I said to him, "Doctor, what do you and those who have been voted down mean to do? Do you mean to shake off the dust of your feet against the Tract Society, as thoroughly wicked and unchristian, and organize a Society on a new basis, with the broad declaration thrown out to the country, that among the sins to be assailed and to be put down by this new Society will be the sin of American slavery? Do you mean to secede?" "Oh, no; we mean to have another fight." After a little more conversation, at the convenient point, I said to him, "Dr. Cheever, suppose it had been another question; suppose that the Executive Committee of the Tract Society had declared that they would not allow anything to appear, in any of the Tract Society's publications, in favor of the doctrine of total depravity; and suppose that that had been the issue at the late meeting, and you had been voted down, as on this question of slavery; would not you, and those who sympathize with you, secede?" "Certainly, my dear sir," said he, "certainly we would." Now, observe; he would have been prompt to have lifted his heel against that Society, and to have denounced it utterly, if it had refused to say anything on the abstract dogma of total depravity; but when it refused to consider the claims of God's perishing poor in the land, and avowed its purpose virtually to do all in its power to protect the vilest oppression in the world, then the Doctor says, "No secession, but another fight!" My heart sank within me, and I felt that the Doctor needed a deeper baptism before he would be brought to "remember those in bonds as bound with them."

Well, the year has rolled round, and I have been waiting to see if there was to be "another fight"; but I have heard no note of preparation; I have seen no summons, on the part of Dr. Cheever or his friends, calling upon those who sympathize with them to come up to this annual meeting of the Tract Society, and again attempt to do battle in behalf of the oppressed. This forenoon is the time for the meeting of the American Tract Society, and I ask (not reproachfully, of course) where is Dr. Cheever? Is he to be at that meeting, unintimidated, more faithful than ever, if possible, in bearing his testimony against the course of that Society. No; this forenoon he is to be in his own church, attending a meeting of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and there is to be no "fight."

This is the reason why we are compelled to criticize Dr. Cheever. We are thankful for all that he does that is anti-slavery, and ready to go as far as we ought to go in thanking him; but still we cannot be blind to this gross inconsistency on his part, and we must speak the the truth, cut where it may. I have no doubt that our testimonies, being spoken in love, and only with an honest desire for the promotion of our glorious cause, will be useful to the Doctor, and to all others who are, under like circumstances, somewhat inconsistent, and somewhat compromising, it may be.

Edmund Quincy, in behalf of the Committee appointed to nominate a list of officers for the Society for the ensuing year, reported the following:

PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Massachusetts.

Peter Libbey, Maine.	Thomas Whitson, Pennsylvania.
Lucius Main, New Hampshire.	Joseph Moore, "
James M. Hawkes, "	Rowland Johnson, New Jersey.
Josiah C. Claflin, "	Alfred Gibbs Campbell, "
Francis Jackson, Massachusetts.	Thomas Garrett, Delaware.
Edmund Quincy, "	Thomas Donaldson, Ohio.
Asa Fairbanks, Rhode Island.	Sarah Otis Ernst, "
James R. Whitcomb, Connecticut.	Benjamin Bown, "
Samuel J. May, New York.	William Hearn, Indiana.
Cornelius Bramhall, "	William Hopkins, "
Amy Post, "	Joseph Merritt, Michigan.
Pliny Sexton, "	Thomas Chandler, "
Lydia Mott, "	Cyrus Fuller, "
Lucretia Mott, Pennsylvania.	Carver Tomlinson, Illinois.
Robert Purvis, "	Caleb Green, Minnesota.
Edward M. Davis, "	Georgiana B. Kirby, California.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, New York City.

RECORDING SECRETARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, Boston.

TREASURER.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Boston.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

William Lloyd Garrison.	Sydney Howard Gay.
Francis Jackson.	Eliza Lee Follen.
Edmund Quincy.	Samuel May, Jr.
Maria Weston Chapman.	William I. Bowditch.
Wendell Phillips	Charles K. Whipple.
Anne Warren Weston.	

The report was accepted, and the list of officers adopted.

Mr. John Beeson made a few remarks in behalf of the Indians of this country, and expressed the hope that this Society would send forth its testimony against the injustice and tyranny to which they are subjected.

The following resolutions in reference to the recent decease of Charles F. Hovey, a member of the Executive Committee of this Society, were then read by the President, and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That this Society is profoundly sensible of the loss it has experienced in the recent death of Charles F. Hovey, for many years an active member and officer of this Society; that they feel deeply the withdrawal of an example so full of fidelity to conscience and of faith in the omnipotence of truth and in the single expediency of the Right; of a character so marked by the highest independence, the sternest integrity, the wisest sagacity; of a life so informed with love, with charity, with goodness and with courage.

Resolved, That as Abolitionists especially we mourn the loss of a companion so brave, so earnest, so wise and so munificent, whose best counsels, whose consistent example, whose ready hand were never withheld from the needs of the Cause, and the benediction of whose countenance gave us hope and comfort in the most trying hours.

Resolved, That we will endeavor to mourn him aright by endeavoring to be, like him, full of faith in the power of ideas and full of good works towards their victory.

Resolved, That the President of this Society be instructed to convey to the widow and family of our deceased brother the assurance of our sympathy in their grief and in their love and admiration of his character, which must prove its best earthly consolation.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet at 3 p. m.

Afternoon Session.—Miss Barbara Stewart, of Cozenovia, a colored young lady, who has been engaged in lecturing on slavery for a few months past, was the first speaker. Her remarks were confined principally to a recital of the wrongs and outrages to which the slave is subjected, and concluded with an earnest appeal for renewed and yet more vigorous effort in his behalf.

Mr. Remond then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That we renew our previously declared testimony against the Colonization Society, for the reasons we have so often assigned, and will spare no occasion to pass unimproved by which we may contribute to put an end to its mischievous spirit and designs, in fostering and perpetuating the hateful and unrighteous prejudice against the proscribed and persecuted colored people of this country.

Mr. R. said he should say but a few words on this subject, because he knew that it was one which had been discussed again and again in their meetings; but in a brief speech he urged the importance of renewing their testimony against the Colonization Society at this time, when the spirit of that Society was manifesting itself in various disguises.

Mr. Burleigh also spoke strongly in favor of the resolution, and showed in a clear light the absurdity as well as injustice and cruelty of the position taken by the Colonization Society.

Andrew T. Foss, of New Hampshire, then took the platform, and gave an encouraging as well as entertaining account of his recent labors in the West. He said he had "hung the banner on the outer wall," heading his bills, "No Union with Slaveholders," and had found an advantage in that, inasmuch as the people, to whom the Gospel had never been preached, were curious to hear what he had to say. He did not wish his audience to understand that his preaching was always acceptable; on the contrary, to many it was very unacceptable, and some had talked about tarring and feathering him, but he had not been brought to the tar kettle yet. He believed that the discussion at the West, as at the East, was narrowing the question down to this point—"Shall we have the continuance of the Union and slavery, or the dissolution of the Union and the abolition of slavery?" He believed that the people generally were coming to the conclusion that slavery could never be abolished while the Union remained; and, by the testimony of slaveholders themselves, slavery could not live a single year after the dissolution of the Union. What he meant by a dissolution of the Union was simply for the North to call home her Senators and Representatives, and declare that she would have no more complicity with a government that stood with its entire weight upon crushed humanity. That was all he meant. If anybody wanted to fight about it, let them fight; but he had no idea of fighting.

Mr. F. then proceeded to speak of the methods of operation which seemed to him most likely to promote the end for which they labored; and among these he regarded the passage of Personal Liberty bills as one of the most efficient The moment there was no hope of recovering the fugitive slave, slavery was at an end. Let the North cease to protect the slaveholder, and let the case stand between the slave and his master, and then, if the colored man would not take care of himself, he (Mr. F.) would ask nothing more for him. He knew he would, and so did the slaveholder; and therefore he said that this Union ought to be dissolved. In what manner? Simply by disregarding the compact on which it stands, taking away its foundation stones. And that amounted to just this: ceasing to be villains and scoundrels, as they always had been from the beginning.

Mr. Foss said that in the West he had found many Democrats ready to sign the petitions for Personal Liberty bills, and he believed that, if proper agencies were put into that field, a majority of all the voters in northern Illinois, Indiana and Ohio might be induced to sign a petition, this next fall, asking for laws that should prohibit slave-hunting on their soil.

Aaron M. Powell introduced the following resolutions in reference to the efforts which have been made for the greater security of personal liberty on Northern soil, and recommended renewed and increased exertion on the part of all friends of freedom in that direction:

Resolved, That while in direct and ceaseless labor for such a revolution in public sentiment as shall secure the total abolition of slavery is our chief and fundamental mission, we recognize in the recent efforts in Massachusetts, New York and elsewhere, for the unqualified prohibition of slave-hunting, a most timely and important work and one which should engage the earnest and untiring co-operation of every Abolitionist, and of all who would have Northern soil truly free and really "an asylum for the oppressed."

Resolved, That we especially recommend to the members and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society in the several States which it represents to at once begin the work of circulating petitions, addressed to their respective Legislatures, demanding the entire prohibition of slave-hunting on their soil.

Mr. Powell said—I fully agree with the remarks of the friend who preceded me (Mr. Foss) as to the importance of giving special attention, at this time, to the protection of the fugitive slave upon our own soil. The end we have in view is, of course, the entire abolition of slavery everywhere, and for that we would unremittingly labor, but the rendering of our own soil really and truly free is a first and highly important preliminary step in the direction of the total abolition of slavery. Massachusetts cannot, with good countenance, ask South Carolina to abolish slavery while she herself refuses protection to the escaped slave, who, fleeing from the oppressor, reaches her soil by dint of the greatest heroism. Sentimental opposition to the Fugitive Slave law is very general, and the time has arrived when it should be made practically efficient for the unqualified prohibition of slave-hunting. Mr. Phillips, in his admirable speech of yesterday morning, said we had in the progress of national development, first sentiment, then thought, then character. Through the untiring labors of Abolitionists for a quarter of a century, the mission of Uncle Tom's Cabin, and from other causes, sentiment has been created, much thought awakened, and now the time is at hand when we have a right to expect and to call for positive action which shall give us a real character for freedom. It is no less than a religious duty which devolves upon us to extend the right hand of fellowship and protection to the escaped boudmen who come in our midst and who would sojourn among us. If any political obligation rests upon us, surely it is to protect the weak against the strong, and to make the Commonwealth which we recognize as our own really "an asylum for the oppressed." To this end we should earnestly demand of the legislatures in our respective States such enactments as shall henceforth absolutely prevent the return or molestation of any fugitive from slavery who shall in any way reach our territory and desire to remain therein.

It is with a feeling of much satisfaction that we are able to point to Vermont as having so nobly taken the initiative in this work. Multitudes, who do not clearly look beyond to the abolition and end of slavery, are shocked with, and heartily opposed to, in sentiment and thought, the rendition of the fugitive to the hell of oppression from which he or she has escaped. Those who constitute our State legislatures are not an exception.

There should, then, be no delay in renewing our petitions, and reiterating our demands, addressed to those who would legislate for us, for the unqualified protection of the fugitive slave, and the greater security of our own liberties.

The time has arrived when it is most apparent that, to the extent to which we fail to extend protection to the escaped slave, our own personal freedom is endangered. In illustration of this I have only to refer you to Cleveland, Ohio, where several citizens of that State are now lying in prison for having dared to be men and Christians. The long arm of slavery through the National government thus deprives the truest and noblest citizens of Ohio of their liberty, and the State has yet to come to their rescue. The same liabilities are our own, of whatever State we may be. Self-considerations and our religious us obligations to our oppressed brother and sister alike admonish us to an earnest espousal of the work which the resolutions suggest.

Let each and all, whether old or young, make it his and her special work to thoroughly circulate petitions and to gain the largest possible number of voices which may thus be heard asking for the legislation proposed. This is a work which all who have the inclination and will may do. Multitudes among the masses need only to be asked for their signatures, and, with well-directed and efficient effort in the circulation of petitions, an overwhelming and irresistible demonstration in behalf of personal freedom in our own dominions can readily be made on the reassembling of our respective Legislatures. The good work has already been well begun. Let us go forward, strong in the truth, faithful in the discharge of our obligations to God and to our fellow-men.

Lucretia Mott then took the platform, and spoke at some length, urging the importance of faithfulness to the great work in which they were engaged, which was not merely to protect the fugitive, but to enlighten the public mind on the great sin of American slavery, and so to hasten the time when the chains of every slave in the land shall be broken. Our columns are already so crowded that we have no room even for a sketch of her excellent and timely remarks.

Mr. Simons, of New York, was the next speaker. He was proud, he said, to be identified with the colored race, because everybody was thinking and talking about them. He thought the time had come when they must act for themselves, and believed they should follow the example of the white people, and resist their oppressors; for "resistance to tyrants was obedience to God." Every man had a right to himself; and the sooner he asserted and vindicated that right, the sooner would he be respected by all.

Mr. Garrison, after a few appropriate remarks, read the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That among the tried and faithful friends of the Anti-Slavery cause who have been removed by death since the last anniversary of this Society, and whose memories deserve to be gratefully and admiringly cherished for their works' sake, Ellis Gray Loring stands conspicuous, having given the earliest public adhesion to an enterprise at that time without friends, and everywhere bitterly hated and proscribed, and sustained it by a life of the purest integrity, of the deepest conscientiousness, of the most perfect disinterestedness and the highest moral intrepidity.

Resolved, That in the death of Judge William Jay, the slave loses a firm, fearless and devoted friend—one of the few Americans who lived equal to the noble Anti-Slavery name he inherited—one whose early and earnest advocacy of emancipation, whose sacrifice of office for his principles, and whose contributions to Anti-Slavery argument and literature, second to none in value and importance, place him in the front rank of those to whom these States will owe, at some future happy day, their salvation from their foulest sin.

Resolved, That an early, intrepid and devoted advocate of the enslaved in our land has been removed by the death of Arnold Buffum, at a ripe old age—one of the signers of the Declaration of Anti-Slavery Sentiments at Philadelphia in 1833, and one of the twelve who organized the New England (now the Massachusetts) Anti-Slavery Society, and its first public lecturer in the enforcement of the doctrine of immediate and unconditional emancipation, to whose earnest and impressive appeals many can trace their conversion to the Anti-Slavery cause—he never allowing an opportunity to pass without bearing an uncompromising testimony against the sinfulness of slavery.

The question was then put on the adoption of the resolutions reported yesterday from the Business Committee, and they were adopted, as follows:

Resolved, That if transforming rational and immortal beings into merchandise and perishable property be not a sin of the first magnitude, and a crime of the deepest dye, then crime and sin nowhere exist on earth, and there are none to be called to repentance.

Resolved, That, conceding to Southern slaveholders the right to hold slaves on Southern soil, and affirming that they may, and in many cases do, exercise this right in accordance with justice, humanity and the spirit of Christianity, is tantamount to a vindication of slavery universally; and therefore, in advocating the re-establishment of the slave system, wherever it has been abolished at the North, the South acts with strict logical consistency, and cannot be met or answered, except by those who maintain the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding under all circumstances.

Resolved, That they who have no moral objection to the existence of slavery at the South can have none to its existence at the North; and that all such, by their constant defence of the slaveholder from the imputation of criminality, are, as far as in them lies, preparing the way for the introduction of slavery into every free State.

Resolved, That between the recognition of the slave as a man, endowed by his Creator with an inalienable right to liberty, and therefore entitled to immediate and unconditional emancipation, and the denial of his common human nature, and his association with cattle, swine and other property, there is no half-way ground.

Resolved, That the enormities of slavery are so multitudinous and appalling—in its annihilation of all human rights, its sacrifice of all parental and filial ties, its contempt for all the laws of God, its disregard of all the commands of the Gospel—that to resist its immediate and total abolition is the most comprehensive method of extending and perpetuating the kingdom of Satan, and opening the floodgates of all iniquity.

Resolved, That the friends of the enslaved in this land have nothing to retract or modify in regard to their charges against the holders of slaves or their abettors—against the American Church, and the clergy of the country generally—against the political parties and their leaders—against the American Constitution and Union; based as those charges are, and have been, upon a broad foundation of facts, which cannot be refuted, and which still remain unchanged.

Resolved, That we cordially accept the taunting admonition of Southern slaveholders, "Mind your own business," as it is our business to see that we neither oppress nor connive at oppression; that we reduce to practice the "self-evident truths" of the Declaration of Independence; that we "hide the outcast, and bewray not him that wandereth"; that we make our soil free to every fugitive slave who stands upon it, and that we cleanse ourselves from all blood guiltiness.

Resolved, That it is the wildest incoherency, on the part of the South, in one breath to charge us of the North with meddling with that which does not concern us, and for which we are not responsible, and in the next, to remind us of the pro-slavery constitutional guarantees we have given her, and insist upon our fulfilling them to the letter—requiring us to allow the slave-hunter to seize his victims in any part of the Northern domains—to recognize slave property in all the Territories of the Union—to perpetuate a slave representation in Congress—to guarantee the suppression of every slave insurrection, even by the strong arm of the National Government, if need be—to consent to the admission into the Union of as many slave States as can be created, and however created—and to aid in the extension of slavery by the acquisition of new territory, obtained whether by purchase, bribery, perfidy, invasion or conquest.

Resolved, That it is the rightful business and imperative duty of the people of the North, without delay, to withdraw themselves from their present alliance with the Southern traffickers in human flesh—to proclaim the unnatural and guilty compact between the free States and the slave States at an end, and to take such measures for the formation of a Northern Union as shall be in accordance with the principles of justice, humanity and impartial liberty.

The resolutions offered by Mr. Powell having reference to the circulation of petitions for the prohibition of slave-hunting, and also the resolution introduced by Mr. Remond, in regard to the Colonization Society, were also adopted.

The President then stated that the only other resolutions before the Society were those introduced by Mr. Pillsbury on Tuesday forenoon. [See first page.]

Some discussion ensued upon these resolutions. Samuel May, Jr., and Mr. Garrison opposed them, on the ground that they linked together persons and associations, as alike worthy of condemnation, between whom there was an essential and vital difference in regard to their position respecting the slave, and that they were therefore unjust. J. A. Howland, of Worcester, Andrew T. Foss, and Aaron M. Powell, spoke in favor of their adoption, maintaining that they expressed nothing but the truth. Finally, the resolutions were laid on the table.

Mr. John Beeson then took the platform, and again called upon the Society to manifest its sense of the injustice that is done to the Indians of this country, and its sympathy for them, by the passage of a preamble and resolution, which the President was constrained to pronounce out of order. Mr. Garrison said that while they all felt that the Indians were oppressed and outraged, yet they were not slaves, and did not therefore come within the scope of that Society, whose object was the extermination of slavery from the land.

The Society then adjourned, *sine die*.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1859.

Correspondents will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Removal.—The Office of The Standard has been removed to the Park Bank Building (adjoining Lovejoy's Hotel), No. 5 Beekman Street. Our friends, after ascending the broad stairs to the second story, cannot fail to discover our sign—

ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD,

in large letters, on the first right-hand door.

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The Annual New England Anti-Slavery Convention will be held in the City of Boston, on Wednesday and Thursday, May 25th and 26th, which we earnestly hope will be attended, from every part of New England, by the old and long-tried friends of the Anti-Slavery Cause, and by those who, younger and fresher in the good work, are emphatically to be relied upon for continuing and upholding it to its sure and perfect triumph.

The Convention will assemble at 10 o'clock of Wednesday, the 25th, at the Music Hall, Winter street, and the subsequent sessions, during that day and the following, will be held (probably) in Mercantile Hall, Summer street.

Friends of the Anti-Slavery movement, whatever the place of their residence, are invited to attend, and will be cordially welcomed.

In behalf of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

FRANCIS JACKSON, President.

Robert F. Wallcut, Rec. Sec.

THE ANNIVERSARY.

The Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery was held at the appointed time and place, last week, with all the prosperity we had prophesied for it. A better meeting, in all respects, was never held since the Society was gathered. On the technical Anniversary on Wednesday morning the beautiful Assembly Room was filled to its entire capacity, and better speeches were never made before it than those uttered on its platform by Mr. Garrison, Mr. Pillsbury, Dr. Furness and Mr. Phillips. But, this year, as for several years past, the Anniversary really extended over the two days of the meeting, as the sessions were held in the same spacious and elegant room, instead of being relegated to a small and dingy upper chamber for the transaction of business. The wisdom of this change of policy was justified by the entire success of the plan, which has now ceased to be an experiment. In spite of the north-easterly storm which, as usual, gave its accompaniment to our assemblies of ourselves together, the attendance was always good and at favorable hours large. This method, though more expensive than the one it has replaced, we believe fully pays for itself, even in a money point of view, by the increased interest given to the occasion. So it will probably remain the fixed policy of the Society for the future.

As the report of the proceedings and speeches will appear in the present issue, we will not recapitulate the names or order of the actors or the speaking, being well assured that full justice will be done to them. All the fixed principles of the Society as to matters in Church and State, the true philosophy and method of anti-slavery agitation, and the experience of the past year in all its various relations, were embodied in the resolutions and elucidated by the speakers. The dead as well as the living had their due share of the thoughts and words of the meeting, and the merits and services of Ellis Gray Loring, Charles F. Hovey and Arnold Buffum received the meed of affectionate remembrance which they claim in every anti-slavery heart. The speaking was singularly good on the whole, and as nearly free from the annoyances which almost inevitably wait upon Free Discussion as is possible in the nature of the case. The Society held four sessions, the last evening being employed by the New York City Society, and was, of course, only a continuance and fit ending of the whole occasion. The hall that night was crowded and the speeches of the highest order of excellence.

We were entirely free from all disturbance from without. Whether it be a good sign or a bad one, the friends of this glorious Union seem to have abandoned the hope of suppressing our conspiracies against its peace and dignity. It is now nine years since Captain Isaiah Rynders was employed by the slave-catching respectability of New York to shut up our mouths and drive us forth into the wilderness. This he succeeded in doing, inasmuch as we could find no place in which to open our mouths for two successive years in the City. But in the third year, either the love of the Union had waxed cold in the heart of Rynders and his employers, or the anti-slavery idea had

THE STANDARD.

THE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A MEETING of the Church Anti-Slavery Society of New York, auxiliary to the lately formed Church Anti-Slavery Society of the United States, was held in the Church of the Puritans, on Wednesday, at 10 o'clock, a. m., Dr. A. H. HART, President, in the chair. The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. McCormick, of Ohio, who was, several years since, virtually expelled from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church for his anti-slavery principles and conduct.

The President (Dr. Hart) delivered the first address, explaining the principles and purposes of the new movement. He declared the basis of slavery to be infidelity, and that the bare recital of its atrocities was enough to set the universe on fire. Yet where was the Church at this day—where were the professed followers of the meek and lowly Jesus? The pulpits are padlocked, the ministry is dumb. There were, however, multitudes scattered through the Churches who have not bowed the knee to Baal. Our platform is distinctively and exclusively Christian. Our trust is in God and in his truth. We cast no reflections upon those who adopt a broader and, as they think, a more catholic principle. If they find that Christianity and infidelity can harmoniously work together, we have no objection to offer; although, a priori, we should have imagined that elements so opposite and discordant would have conflicted as decidedly and disastrously in a great moral enterprise of this description as freedom and slavery have ever conflicted in the government of this nation. The Church Anti-Slavery Society had got hold of the anti-slavery subsoil plough, and were setting it in the earth beam deep, and a blessed and glorious crop would be the result of its work.

EDWARD GILBERT, Esq., also addressed the meeting briefly and pertinently. He said the difference between the Church Anti-Slavery Society and some other organizations was, that the former came down upon the Church with the thunder of God's word for its reformation, while the latter, like Guy Fawkes, sought to blow it up from the bottom!

Dr. CHEEVER then delivered an address, a sketch of which we copy from *The Herald*.

I am glad to hear the remarks made here about holding on to the Constitution and the Church, and all the truths enshrined in them. Now, our greatest enemies are professed Christians themselves. The inevitable consequence of this is that the contest against this wickedness must be carried on by true Christians. We will carry it on if we are such; if not, then God will raise up others to contend against those who are false. Now, in presenting some of the reasons which impel us to this present organization, I do not speak of the inconsistencies and shams indescribable in the conduct of divines who can write volumes on the sacredness of infant baptism and the grace and power of that ordinance, and its invaluable worth and blessedness to all believing parents, and at the very same time write volumes defending as an ordinance and gift of Divine providence a system of slavery and chattelism which excludes slave parents from this Christian duty and slave children from this Christian rite. Slavery can never be broken up and destroyed as long as its support is not deemed inconsistent with the profession of Christianity, not incongruous with the most elevated Christian experience. If men are taught by their religion that they are to serve both God and Mammon, they will do so. The piety that can make merchandise of men, and then sanctimoniously call upon us to adore the mysterious ways of God as appointing such merchandise for the extension of the gospel—the conscience that can wash itself from such guilt with the lie that God has appointed slavery and sanctioned it as a means of holiness and glory—will never renounce the privilege of such instrumentality. Says the Rev. Dr. Adams—"Such have been the marvellous acts of Divine grace to the Africans in bringing them, through the cupidity and sinfulness of men, to this country, and in saving great multitudes of them, that it requires neither strong faith nor force to suppose that this work may still go on in the form of an interchange of blacks between Africa and the Southern States." "The South has learned to be, and is fitted to be, the protector and the friend of the African"; and again says a priest at the altar of the modern Moloch of society, "Of all the situations in which human beings can be placed favorable for the salvation of their souls, under faithful efforts on the part of teachers, it is difficult to conceive of one better suited to this end, and in fact more successful, than the relation of the slaves and their Christian masters." It is not only asserted by this writer, in direct contradiction to the testimony of divine revelation, that the relation of slavery is favorable for the conversion of the soul, but it is even intimated that the African slave trade can be renewed upon Christian principles. A Christian missionary in Western Africa informs us that among the people there no child can be born a slave; that both father and mother may be slaves, yet their children are free. But in America, the parents for whom slavery has stood godfather to bring them into the Christian Church, enjoy the ineffable happiness of knowing that their children cannot escape the same celestial care and guardianship. This relation, so favorable to salvation, assumes them as its heirs from birth; they never can be anything but slaves, and never can be snatched away by Satan from that relation which a Christian divine has pronounced to be of all others the most favorable to the salvation of their souls. Can anything add to the atrocity of such sentiments as these? It had been my intention on this occasion to go into a somewhat lengthened examination of the case of Bailey versus Poindexter's Executors, recently decided in the Supreme Court of Appeals in Virginia, but I will defer it to some other occasion. The point of the case is simply this, that slave laws, slave jurisprudence, slave justice, slave Christianity, denies to the slave, as a human being, the possibility of volition, except solely, supremely and in all possible cases for the benefit of the master. Therefore, no slave, even by the will of the master manumitting him, can choose his freedom, and he must be continued as a slave forever and ever, both himself and all his posterity. The argument of the counsel against the freedom of the slave rivals in the shamelessness and effrontery of its moral atrocity the plea of Chief-Justice Taney, with its culminating proposition that "black men have no rights that white men are bound to respect." There is nothing that more terribly demonstrates the nature of slavery in its essence than this destruction of the personality of a human being, as to his ownership and enjoyment of it, and its conversion into merchandise; the violent abstraction of it from himself, and the transfer of it, so stolen, to the possession of the master as his property. It is a living, lasting, continuous crime, not confined to one act of cruelty and miscreancy, but reproduced, reduplicated, a perpetual piracy, as uninterrupted as human life in its renewal. The dagger of the murderer cannot strike through the life of the murdered man into the life of another generation; but the law of slavery, after the first blow, the first assassination, renews the victim. The first man may be struck down without law, but the second and every victim after is struck down by the law itself; the whole community where it is tolerated becoming accessory after the fact to the first transgression, securing its repetition and its profit by municipal provisions forever. It is a crime perpetrated against two human beings to-day, repeated by the law of the system against five or ten more in the next ten years, and through those five or ten against twenty-five or fifty more within the next twenty years thereafter. The essence and exasperation of the crime in the generation by whom it is legalized consists in this: that it creates the perpetuity of crime and fastens it as a hereditary plague, accepted, fostered and defended by one race, and endured in misery by another. The comparison sometimes instituted between slavery and intemperance fails, because the stamina of drunkards becomes destroyed, and it is a law that three successive generations of drunkards have no issue. But slaves multiply, and that is the chief item of consideration in the value of the sin—its productiveness by natural propagation making it seductive beyond all example of rival iniquities. So fatally blinding is the power of interest and custom against the sense of sin, that it is only the first theft that is supposed to be sinful, only the first step against God and man that costs the conscience or the community a qualm. All the successive steps are by force of law transmuted into duties, and the whole system into a work of national expediency. The sin, the crime, the outrage against God and man, are every year increasing and spreading, while the sense of crime is all the while diminishing. Is it to be imagined that because men take up a crime, and put it into the form and category of a law, they, therefore, get the upper hand of the Almighty and constrain Him to endorse their usurpation of his own authority because they have passed it into law, and carried it to their Supreme Court, and declared it constitutional? Because the trick was apparently successful, and the forgery accepted by one generation, does it lose still more of its guilt in the second, and in the third is it to be washed white and consecrated as a perfect righteousness? Because this mass of monstrosities is very difficult to be got rid of, is it declared to be a religious conservative expediency to receive it into the Christian Church; Christian divines do not hesitate to accept the whole system as it is, and to assert for it a divine authority over the conscience of men. It is contended that, though in the beginning an iniquity against God and man, possession for generations not only establishes an indefeasible title, but changes the quality and essence, so that that which at first was wrong is made a right. That act of cruelty which, committed against one human being or one family, was a sin, when practised against four million of human beings, and secured to be practised forever on all their posperity, becomes a system of perfect wisdom and piety, not to be questioned or spoken against or confronted with the law of God in regard to it. And this most horrible monstrosity is admitted and accepted by the very party claiming to be preeminently the party of freedom, equal rights and Christianity. The assumption of Governor Wise that lapse of time has given to slaveholders as perfect a title to their slaves as to their other goods and chattels is admitted to be good, sound reasoning. When slavery first began, and was committed only upon some thousands, there was some propriety in questioning it, and in considering the law of God in relation to it; but now that the subjects of the cruelty and the crime have grown to four millions, it is an institution of society no longer to be denounced and rebuked as a sin, but admitted into the Christian Church, mollified and inspired with grace, and, since it cannot be cast out as a devil, installed and worshipped as a saint. When each of these four millions is worth to the owner a thousand dollars, and every two are the guarantee of increasing thousands from year to year, the claim of property becomes so vast that the sin of such a claim entirely disappears, and God's law is put quite out of countenance beside it as an interloper and robber. The sin and its profits become a vast vested right, with which society dare not intermeddle, and which it is the duty of Christian conservatism to protect. The claim of property in one human being may be by the law of God a sin worthy of death; but when the claim of property comes to be the right of 300,000 to the ownership of four millions, these sinful claims become a mass of vested rights more sacred than any other rights on earth, to be protected with the whole power of the government. And when we undertake to proclaim, in God's name, the duty of abolishing this wickedness, and setting free the millions already its victims, we are answered that this wickedness is a vested right—a right of popular and State sovereignty where it now exists, with which we must not interfere. All that justice, expediency and constitutional law will permit us to do is merely to oppose its extension over territory now free. We are warned that any effort for the abolition of slavery will injure the prospects of the political party that hopes to ride into political power on the ground of being opposed to slavery, and at the same time pledged to support the vested rights of perpetual property in the four millions already enslaved. No political Rarey can place one foot on the back of one of these steeds and the other foot on the back of the other, and succeed in riding to the Presidential house in Washington (applause). It would be a compact with conscience on the one hand and Satan on the other, never before attempted on so grand a scale, and never yet successful. Yet the plan is considered, and, inasmuch as political dexterity dare not attempt to ride these two steeds bare-backed, the platform is to be laid across their saddles, and a driver's seat contrived in the middle point between the two, so that, they being well hitched together, the driver, with reins in both hands, bending now to the one side and now to the other, as occasion demands, may seem to be managing the party now with one set of principles, and now with the other; now with an appeal to conscience, now an appeal to the sacredness of vested rights; now invoking God, and now Mammon; now a crack of the whip with a snapper from the Bible, now a thrust as with Satan's pike staff against abolitionism—the whole machine and juggernaut of party being driven at a fierce gallop, in any case, over the groaning, bleeding forms, annihilated rights and enslaved families of the four millions now in bondage. If there be not a crack of gear, a snorting and rearing, a parting of the harness, and a complete sommerset of this political fabric before it reins up at the capitol, then we wholly mistake the signs of the people and the times. There must be but one steed, one set of conscientious principles, one steadfast representative pledged to them in order to secure the people. We, as Christians, cannot, at any rate, afford to waste our strength or throw away our votes in any other way. As to pledging ourselves to let slavery alone, to give up all intention and effort for its abolition, or to respect, as a vested right, of which we promise to be the conservative party, the privilege of holding four millions of our fellow-beings and their posterity, to the end of time, in abject bondage, as property, such a pledge would be the laying down of our own necks upon the rail track of this iniquity, and the cars would thunder over our own liberties. Such a pledge would be both a political and religious perdition. Now, the question is, what are our weapons, and what are the conditions of the fight? Are they such as Christians alone can faithfully and sincerely use, and on the ground only of the authority of God's Word, and the commission of his righteousness and love? If they are, then it is plain that such an organization as we are now forming is absolutely necessary, and we must have our colors and drums and recruiting regiments all over the country. There are those who are mad and foolish enough to throw away and curse both the Bible and the Constitution because the religious slavocracy pervert and claim them both as their allies. But we are not going thus to cut our own throats, or betake ourselves to such cursing. The soldiers at Valley Forge, when without food, clothing, shoes, knapsacks, powder and ball, might just as well have proclaimed an independence of all such material reliances, might just as well have fallen to cursing every regiment that stood in shoes, every company that could not do without rations, and every battle that could not be fought without powder and ball. Fisticuffs against bayonets, and empty famishing stomachs against fat frames, and curses instead of bullets, are not the thing—are not to be relied upon. Moreover, the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, though mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds. Meantime we shall keep and use the vantage ground God has given, of whatever kind; and neither the Constitution, as a free document, nor the Bible, as a righteous and divine power, shall ever be wrested from us or carried over into the possession of our enemies. The assertion that the Bible sanctions slavery is a master lie of the father of lies and the murderer from the beginning (applause)—and the infamous claim of a place for slavery in our Constitution, under pretence of service due, is so vile, so piratical, that all illustration of this treachery is inadequate. The gigantic and sublime pettifoggery and forgery that on the phrase of "service due" could build the diabolical system of American slavery beats all the feats of rope dancers, wild beast tamers and jugglers. How can the world be patient, how can the Church be silent, how can Christianity forbear under such a construction, such a creation of cruelty out of equity, of falsehood out of truth, of darkness out of light, of forgery out of honesty, of man-stealing out of "service due"? It is as if, having by covenant the right to navigate the North river for a certain period, you had built all the way up from New York to Albany a line of docks for the building of slave ships, constructing your wharves and piers on land made for this very purpose, for the making of which land you have put under cultivation for years all the dirt carts and scavengers of the city, all the sweepings of your courts and streets. Thus it is that in this vacant water lot of the Constitution, all the apologists for slavery, all the moral scavengers of unprincipled religious and political parties, dump their rich and fragrant cartloads. All slave courts and administrations deposit the feculence of their cruelties, their slave jurisprudence, their precedents of injustice, their Dred Scott decisions, their ungainly cubs and imps of lying, fostered, civilized and scented by Christian judges into fashionable dandy truths—their oppressive, outrageous ostracisms, fines, banishments, social and civil disabilities, and tortures of the colored race. The sun never whitened so enormous a fraud, so malignant a cruelty, perpetrated in the name of constitutional justice. It makes one's feelings curl in agony to think of a professedly free, pious and Christian people permitting such an atrocity as the transmutation of the children of four million of human beings into merchandise, under the words "service due," when God has forbidden the buying or selling even of the parents, themselves, on pain of death (applause). A constitutional mint for counterfeit money, on the ground of a provision for coining silver and gold, would be nothing compared to such wickedness. Now, we hardly know what to say as to the madness of those who, professing to be the friends of freedom and the slave, admit such lies and usurpations in and by the Constitution, and on that admission fall to cursing and raving against it. Some men in this conflict act like thieves and housebreakers in case of fire; instead of helping to extinguish the flames, they scatter shavings, rosin and tar through the apartments, by which the fire may run through and envelop the whole building. They pour spirits of turpentine into the fire buckets; and then you may see them throwing costly mirrors out of the windows and bringing brass andirons in their hands carefully down stairs (laughter). It is for the Church to rescue the Word of God and the Christianity of the Cross from the ineffable reproach of sanctioning such wickedness. We may, perhaps, hope that we have gone to the bottom of such debauchery and hypocrisy, and may now begin to build up. Churches of every denomination, Tract Societies and Missionary Societies have fallen down and worshipped this dragon, and, in so doing, have lent to the enemy of the Redeemer the power of supposed piety to betray and dishonor his name before a railing and blaspheming community. The venerated American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, by the very position to which the Divine blessing has elevated it, strikes so much the deadlier a blow at the interests of Christianity, and is guilty of so much the more glaring betrayal of the cause of Christ, when it endures for one moment an iniquity so palpable within any of the Churches under its care and control, and much more when it receives the iniquity into the bosom of half-developed, half-taught Churches, and defends it there. Instead of hearing and obeying the Divine voice, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee; put on thy beautiful garments, for there shall no more intrude upon thee the unclean," that association seems to have heard and obeyed a mandate from the mother of harlots and abominations—"Go down from thy throne of light, put aside thy beautiful garments and wallow in the mire, the heathen shall admire thy darkness and despots shall come to the gloom of thy setting sun." It is impossible to go any deeper than to admit slaveholding into the bosom of Christian and missionary Churches as not inconsistent with the religion of the Cross. And now the Church itself, by a mighty reaction and resurrection within itself, must repel this most iniquitous reproach and scandal. The catapults of Satanic, infidel malignity may hurl stones as big as mountains against this sin within the Church, but without the slightest effect, unless from within a purifying power is used to cast out this devil. Their railings will have no more effect than the blasphemies of Rabshakeh. Salvation must come from within, from the word hidden in the heart, from God, from Christ, from the Holy Spirit, with the flame of divine truth bursting forth at length from an agonized conscience. In this way will God send forth judgment to victory, cause his name to be again honored and his ordinances to be restored to their purity that have been blasphemed among the Gentiles by the endurance of this sin. The Church has a power that the severest enemies of that wickedness without have not. Traitors within the Church have spiked her guns, and we are compelled to drill them out again or cast them over anew; but when that is done, all that is needed is to load and fire, and nothing can stand against such a battery (applause). It is a deadly conflict, not a mere display of pyrotechnics. As yet not one single Church is engaged, and the very gunners handle their weapons with kid gloves. What we want to see is men begrimed with sweat and powder, loading and firing just as rapidly as the guns will bear. Almost nothing of the fire of God's Word has yet blazed forth. It has been administered in little squibs touched off at arm's length—no purpose, no earnestness, no effort. The Word of God religiously and the Constitution of the United States politically are the upper and nether millstones between which the iniquity can be ground to powder. Both have been long and fearfully perverted. We have to recapture our weapons from the hand of the enemy. The speaker then adverted to the incompatibility of the sacred marriage institution with slavery. If slavery was sanctioned by God, marriage was not. The family relation among slaves was nothing but a breeding factory for the wealth and at the pleasure of the master. Marriage to the slave was a paradise as impossible as that of the Peri. Think, then, of a minister of the Gospel, with the slave code before his eyes, deliberately declaring that under a Christian master no relation could be conceived on earth more favorable to salvation than that of slavery! The scriptural injunctions in reference to the duties of parents to children were a perfect mockery to slaves. What slave-mother ever thought of bringing her child to the altar in the sacred consecration to God, when perhaps the only answer she can make, surrounded by her children, to the question, Who is its father? has to be, as was given in one case, "Who knows?" In conclusion, the speaker said that the Christians united against slavery could drive their wedge-shaped phalanx with a power that would split any pro-slavery army in two, cut it down as with a scythe, and sweep it away as with a whirlwind. The destinies of this country are at the command of the Church. When the oppressed were set free, and every yoke broken, then in religion will be seen such a reality as the world has never yet witnessed. Then will infidelity be conquered; then will there be no more doubt as to the plenary inspiration of God's Word or the efficacy of Christianity as a reforming power. Then the masses of thoughtful men that have been grovelling in darkness will be drawn upwards by the very rush of the air from the motion of the radiant chariot of God's incarnate love, and will find themselves winged with light, spontaneously whirling onwards with grateful hallelujas, in the train of the Redeemer of oppressed men. Then thousands whom a traitorous Church and a slaveholding Christianity have seized, bound and thrown into the toils of Satan, to be led captive at his will, will rejoice to find their own bondage breaking at the touch of this celestial flame of piety, as flax before the fire (applause).

Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER submitted the following resolutions, which were adopted:

Resolved, That this Society regards with great interest the overture from the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of the United States, upon the subject of communion with slaveholders, addressed to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, soon to be convened at Wilmington, Delaware, and we wait with deep anxiety the action of the General Assembly upon that eminently Christian remonstrance, urging, as it does, a declaratory announcement that hereafter slaveholding shall be a bar to Christian communion in their branch of the Presbyterian Church.

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this Church Anti-Slavery Society, this is the specific action demanded by our common Christianity from all branches of the Christian Church in our land, and that, in the language of the important and able overture referred to in the foregoing resolution, "the performance of this great duty at this time would tend greatly to shut down the flood gates of one of the most dangerous forms of infidelity which the world has ever seen—an infidelity which humane and liberty-loving men naturally fall into when they see the visible Church in league with a system of oppression which their consciences and common sense condemn."

Resolved further, That, in the judgment of this Society, American slavery, if not speedily arrested in its usurping and demoralizing course by the deliberate action of American Churches, will paralyze and heathenize the Church of Christ in the slaveholding States, and drive its witnessing members into the caves and dens of the earth, and over a prostrate and servile Church it will proceed to the ruin of our national liberties, by an oligarchy of slaveholding aristocrats, or by a military despotism in the services of slavery.

Mr. GILBERT stated that only a President and Secretary had as yet been chosen for this branch Society. He nominated the following named persons, who were elected.

Treasurer—Edgar Ketchum, Esq. Executive Committee—John Jay, Esq., Andrew Morgan, Esq., Rev. Mansfield French, Dexter Fairbanks, Esq., and Lewis Tappan, Esq.

THE BOSTON AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

THE Boston American Tract Society (whose policy of compromise is well understood by the readers of THE STANDARD) held a meeting at the Church of the Puritans on Thursday, May 12th, at 10 o'clock a. m. The house was crowded to its utmost capacity, in consequence of the announcement that the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher would speak on the occasion.

Rev. Dr. KIRK, of Boston, made the first speech, the most important part of which was the declaration that the connection of the American Tract Society in Boston with the American Tract Society of New York was to be dissolved. Dr. Kirk was followed by the Rev. DANIEL VROOMAN, a returned missionary from Canton.

Mr. BEECHER next took the floor and was received with enthusiastic applause. The following sketch is from *The Times*.

Mr. BEECHER said that it was not possible for Christians from all parts of the land to come up to anniversaries without a solemn sense of the presence of God in all the world. He is speaking by the voice of war and by rumors of war, by terrors and by revolutions. Every one who reads the times, every one who studies them in the light of God's Word must know that we are on the eve of great things, either for evil or for good; if for evil, that good may result by and by. Everywhere men are stirring, on all continents, on all islands of the sea. There are almost no places in the world where men are torpid except in Tract Societies (laughter). In this country we are stirred up not by wars and revolutions, but minds are agitated. Some are growing fierce, many hot. But why don't things that crack continents happen here? Because the discussion of all questions being free disarms danger. While emperors and kings and little kings, and priests and little priests are being tossed as ships are by storms, we are in no turmoil. Disunion is spoken of; there are some men who sleep on disunion, who dine on it and make it their week-day devotion, but the Union is too selfish to break up. There is nothing the devil could gain from it and much that Christ might, so there is no danger from that quarter. He would that the lesson of free discussion had been learned as thoroughly by all the rest as it had been by some; or, rather, that it had been learned as thoroughly by some as it had been by all the rest. Yesterday he had learned much of the things that related to Christ's kingdom. By a morning paper, which Mr. B. cited, he found that he had been instructed by the Rev. Daniel Lord. It must have been Daniel in the lion's den that time (laughter). He had learned, among other things, that deliberative bodies were not the place to discuss great moral questions in. When I looked around that assembly, said Mr. B., and saw that every other man was gray-haired—when I thought that the average age of those present was at least fifty years—why, I should as soon have thought of sending fire-engines to put out tomb-stones as to need the gag law to quench such fire as was likely to rage there. Last year the Society had special preaching clerical, and they thought they would try the lawyer this time; for when Christ was to be put down in the temple, the Jews had need of both, and they put them in the Tract Society this year to plead, not the merits of the question, not the things which you think or which I think, but to speak wire-pulling, caucusing, managing political things (great applause). The object was to keep men from taking part who had something to say, and to let men that had nothing to say have a chance to say it (renewed applause). He had heard Dr. Kirk's address, and the audience probably understood that as he had done up all the sweetness, the other part was left for him (Mr. B.) to supply. They might take it for granted that he had any number of pleasant things to say; that was his temper, as they all knew (laughter). But he thought it was high time that the North American should take the field against the South American Tract Society. As an old man says to his son, when the cares of business begin to press upon him, that he will leave the details of business to him while he keeps a general eye on affairs, so the Boston Society, for that is the oldest, said the same thing to the American Tract Society. But the old man finds out sometimes that things are not going right and again assumes the supervision; so it was high time for the Boston Society to take affairs out of the hands of the boys who assembled yesterday at the Opera house (excessive laughter and applause).

Mr. Beecher then proceeded to review the arguments of the Rev. Daniel Lord, as the morning paper he quoted styled him. The first statement made, Mr. Lord thought all men, women and boys could understand. Mr. Beecher had some of each class in his nature, and he thought he could understand the statement. It sounded to him very much like a lawyer's plea, notwithstanding the fact that the speaker was styled Reverend (laughter). Mr. Lord said there were two things to be considered: the object of the gifts made to the Society, and the manner of their administration. To Mr. B's mind the first seemed the most important, but this the Reverend gentleman slightd altogether and passed on to consider the mode in which they were to be administered. Circulation, Mr. Lord urges, is the great object of issuing tracts. He passes in view all the great moral truths and questions; these are nothing, their object is not to declare principles, but to circulate. Mr. B. always supposed that quality had something to do with the question of circulation. But, then, why not circulate tracts in the South? Oh! they are not wanted there, and the plain English of Mr. Lord's language is, that if tracts won't circulate, they might as well print them in an unknown tongue as to issue those which men don't want. As soon, therefore, as a man is found out not to want the truth, then you are to stop giving it to him. Of course if any one should take tracts to Mercer street, they will not be wanted there, but is that any reason they should not be distributed? Suppose some one should take tracts on stealing to the Five Points. "What do you mean," they would say, "by sending your tracts here? We don't want them. We have no morals down here" (excessive laughter). There ought to be a census taken of what men want. Thus far the business of the Society has never been conducted properly. But how do they know that tracts on slavery won't circulate South? Mr. Beecher said that not south of Mason and Dixon's line, but south of Virginia, he would engage to find 100 men that would read tracts on slavery for every one who would read the ordinary publications of the Society. The men who support such doctrines as these are the men who wrap themselves up in cocoons, and think no one else is different from them. Many hundreds South do not hold slaves, and they are hungering to know what the truth is. Well digested tracts and those properly written, they will read. Even those on the duties of masters will be circulated there. Some say masters have no duties; but they have. The first is emancipation (great laughter); all the rest follow in natural order. The duties of servants—or if that is not plain enough, the duties of slaves—would come next, for the oppressed in the sight of God's law have their duties to perform. Mr. Beecher pledged himself, emphatically, to see that 20,000,000 pages of tracts on slavery should be circulated in the Southern States if the Tract Society would issue them. I make the offer, said he, for the Society to take it up if it will. But Mr. Lord says that the Society first circulates, then it elects, and then it dies. The elected do everything else. Then all the functions of the members cease. Mr. Beecher contended that the Society might further instruct, and that the Publishing Committee were bound to act on their instructions. He ridiculed the idea of there being any less chance of the truth coming out in the large assembly than when the six met. He could conceive that there might be some subject relating to the unity of the human race, or some question in Mongolian ethics, which it would be dangerous to discuss in a popular assembly. But this question of slavery has been discussed by these men in all meetings; and when they come together in the Tract Society, they are told that it is not safe to trust them with talking it over; they can eliminate nothing that would be for the advantage of the Tract Society. Mr. B. never before knew a body of men that undertook to usurp power they did not have, and then endeavored to shut up men's mouths. Yet, both things have been done in this city of New York. They have shut up men's mouths as effectually as ever Louis Napoleon did. Had it occurred in Washington, it could not have been wondered at. Surprise at anything which could take place there is an emotion which has long since died out; but that the deed should have been accomplished by men who fairly reeked with devotion is wonderful. If the sweet odor of sanctity could have saved them, they would have smelled to heaven (laughter). I should like, said Mr. Beecher, with an inimitable air, to be an agent and go around collecting money for the Society. I should like to go to a simple farmer and tell him, "My friend, it is your duty to give me $10 or $20." The farmer says, "What will be done with the money?" "Why, my friend, it will go into the Treasury of the Lord." "Yes, but who has charge of it then, who holds the bag?" (Great laughter.) "Why, it is held by those men who pray all day, and who read the Bible and do all these good things, and then shut up men's months." "Yes, but how is the money going to be used?" "Why, my friend," I should of course reply, "you are meddling with things which do not at all concern you; the Committee manages that" (excessive laughter). Or suppose I should go to a couple of others, said Mr. B., and persuade one to give me $20; one becomes a life member; the other gives $50, and he is made a life director; and now they are going to have part in the management of the Society. They go to the Academy of Music. Him of the red ticket is put on one side, and him with the other ticket on the other. It is difficult to tell what they are going to do, but there is a speech made and a buzzing about follows, and they finally go out. "Well," one says, "what have you done?" and the other replies, "What have *you* done?" and they both ask, "What have *they* done?" (Laughter.) And what have *they* done but dupe two men, and get $20 from one, and $50 from the other? If these men were not so good—if they did not pray morning and night—if they did not read their Bibles until they were worn out—they could not stand in their positions for a year, their conduct is so outrageous. I was urged, yesterday, said Mr. B., to go upon the platform and speak. I was told I *could* do so if I would, but you don't catch me playing frog for any one—jumping on a platform to be put down again, and they all know it. If you let this year go by unmarked, if this land lets these men go on so regardless of the principles of religion and morals and of right, civil as well as ecclesiastical government, we have passed a crisis indeed. But there is a public sentiment which will drown out even the Tract Society. It goes so surely and certainly to the execution of its duty that there need be no haste. There has never been an age in which men, feeling the evils of the time, have cried out more earnestly, "How long, O, Lord, how long?" Suffering slaves, and many men, lift up their prayers, and yet the great God dwells in Eternity; and though he seems to delay, he will come. He will yet mark for condign punishment the men who, under the name of religion, have violated our rights and our liberties. If that is Christianity which they are practising, they have another Testament than mine. But there is another question, said Mr. B., which must be considered. It is the problem of Asia, of Europe, of North America and of South America. What is the duty of the strong to the weak? The world says they must serve the strong, but the Bible gives another answer—that the duty of strength and might is to embosom weakness—to open the heart to be a shelter for them and if Calvary has done any one thing, it has taught the truth that God laid himself down a sacrifice for the weak, and that he arose again lifting them up in the majesty of his might. God teaches by the voice of Calvary, by the death and resurrection of his Son, to take care of the weak, love them, lift them, raise them that they may be helped and that you may help them. What says England when the question is put to her, What is the duty of the strong to the weak? To get opium and indigo out of them. France says take them from the coast of Africa as voluntary slaves. Our nation says give them the cat-o'-nine-tails. I can never forget, said the speaker, that my father and my father's father, that my mother and my mother's mother, were members of a church on earth; and if Christ had not sanctified it, it would be enough for me that they had belonged to it, and God forbid that I should ever forget it. I would stand and see the year's work go past without lifting a finger if I might see the church of my fathers standing in the Lord's place and doing the Lord's work. For more than thirty years the diapason of this nation has been the sighing and dying of the slave. In my day, said Mr. Beecher, the conflict has taken place. He remembered the day of mobs, when Birney's press was thrown into the Ohio, when Theodore D. Weld was pelted with unvitalized eggs, and when it was as much as a man's life was worth to be called an Abolitionist. But those Churches which refused to discuss the question have been overrun with it; Synods which have erected dykes have been overwhelmed by it; even General Assemblies have been carried captive, and whole neighborhoods have been converted. The Tract Society is about the only Society that has maintained a bad consistency; and if to speak for the poor and oppressed will be accounted for condemnation in the Day of Judgment, it will not have this sin to answer for. He was ashamed of the institution. If they would give up their claim to being considered a religious Society, and, taking the money they had obtained under *false pretences*, devote it to publishing books in the line they had laid out, he would find no fault. But now the Society stands as authorized by the Churches, while there is not a vice or sin not inherent in slavery, the crime which they are called on to condemn. They are so busy teaching the Gospel that they cannot touch lying, stealing and adultery, and this because there is a certain kind of religion which they can teach apart from practice. But who do you suppose I think teaches the most infidelity? Do you imagine I would designate Theodore Parker? No one need be afraid of him; he is too open and above-board. Shall I say Garrison or Wendell Phillips; him of the iron tongue or silver lips? No, no; though they are called very naughty infidels, and I am afraid they are not as sound as I am, I should not call them such dangerous men. Both of them would have to take a little more catechism before they will be orthodox (laughter). It must be some infidel bookseller then. No, a man might as well think of selling cockroaches as of disposing of such books in a Christian community. When a young man wants one of them, he is too far gone for them to do him any harm. The men who are lubricated to sleek devotion, who have a text for every omission and commission, who make long prayers while they are devouring widows' houses, who turn up their eyes whenever they mean to do a wicked thing, who take the livery of heaven to serve the devil in, these are the men who are the most dangerous teachers of infidelity. They are the lawyers and pharisees whom Christ denounced. I declare, said Mr. B., that the temple stands again in Nassau street, and that the priests and lawyers are there, as the priests and lawyers were in the temple of old (sensation). Turning to his father, who was in the pulpit, leaning over the desk, he said, that were he as old as him, if the Society which he now addressed should ever take the stand the American Tract Society had, in the suppression of free inquiry, he would denounce it just as fearlessly as he had done the former. God had sent them to do a great work. Use your other brethren, whom you love so much. I love them too—I mean all the pious things, but you must take them for granted. Use those brethren as the Spartans did their Helot slaves. Show them to your children, as they rise and stagger, that in their wickedness they may learn a lesson from the sight (sensation). Mr. Beecher ran a parallel between the Apostles of old and the Executive Committee of the Society (reading the names of the latter, and emphasizing the D.D. at the end of each). If the Apostles had gone to work as they did now-a-days, he asked how long it would take to evangelize the world. He had the greatest respect for these gentlemen. If they were here, he would treat them with the same respect he showed the other ladies (laughter). The doctrine taught at the meeting of the previous day was that the executive of the Society must inculcate no doctrines which the people did not want to hear. The doctrine and the place of meeting were just alike. There were little fat wooden cherubs sitting all around the galleries; there too were the caryatedes—old men and women bearing each one their burden, and all were cut off at the legs so as to keep them from running away. These were fit objects to receive the gospel inculcated there in the Opera House. In conclusion, Mr. B. said he hoped he should have an opportunity of explaining to the Secretaries of the Tract Society in a private interview, if he had said anything to hurt their feelings or those of any of the Executive Committee.

The same deafening applause which interrupted the delivery of the address was given at its close. The address must be considered in every respect as Mr. Beecher's, but the continual and indignant flashes of sarcasm and the bitter denunciation, no report can do full justice to. The audience leaned forward from their seats, the clergymen in the pulpit came up to the desk that they might not lose a word, and more than once tears were streaming down cheeks where they are not often seen. The Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher, the father of the speaker, was directly behind Mr. Beecher and did not take his seat during the delivery of the address.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS ASSOCIATION.

THE National Woman's Rights Association held its annual meeting at Mozart Hall, on Tuesday evening, May 12th. The hall was crowded to its utmost capacity. *The Times* says: "The speeches were so temperate, while sundry voters were so intemperate in demonstrating their folly, rudeness, ignorance and indecency, that almost any cause that the one pleaded and the other objected to would be likely to find favor with order-loving people. The presence of a single policeman might have preserved perfect order, saved the reputation of our city before hundreds of strangers, and given hundreds an opportunity to hear what they went to hear, but which the disturbance utterly prevented their hearing. Of course, it being a meeting that women were to address, and as 'women have no rights in public that men are bound to maintain,' there was no policeman present."

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, of Rochester, presided. The following sketch of the speeches is from *The Times*.

Mrs. CAROLINE H. DALL, of Boston, was the first speaker. She read her address, which she said was mostly extracted from one of a series of lectures delivered last year in Boston. The few who could hear her perceived that she was reading a notice of the career of Mary Wolstoncraft, the daughter of Godwin, and the author of the *Rights of Woman*. Mrs. Dall had carefully read this famous book which had been so much abused, and found it a simple determined plea for the education of woman. If reprinted now, just a century since the birth of its author, it would only be objected to as too stupid—repeating what now is well known and admitted. We should miss the smack of fanaticism, which is so much relished, but it subsoiled English life in its day. It was dedicated to Talleyrand, and in the preface of dedication alone was to be found anything that would seem to justify the wrath of her abusers. Mrs. Dall's remarks, except in that they justified the marriage of her heroine to one, to whom she refused to be united according to the marriage ceremony, could have offended none of her audience. But throughout the whole course of them she was interrupted by cries of "louder," "louder," "sit down," "go on," &c., until, while not half through, saying that the presiding officer of the meeting had assured her that it was doubtful if she could make herself heard, she sat down amidst applause.

Miss ANTHONY hoped the audience would be quiet, while they were addressed by the pioneer of their cause, Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia.

Mrs. MOTT sympathized with the audience, who were evidently impatient because they could not hear. Remembering how irksome long speeches must be, especially to those who could not hear them, and remembering that woman had not yet been much educated to fill with her voice public halls, she would speak briefly. She said it was altogether unnecessary to define the intentions of the advocates of woman's rights. She only wished to point out how the prophecy of Catharine Beecher, twenty years ago, had come true, that woman was not now satisfied to do a little sewing, a little reading, a little embroidery, but was thinking for herself, and working with reference to the saving of souls. Now, woman, no longer trusting to the interpretation of her master, was reading the Bible for herself. Some South side Adams, some John Chambers, might yet, by garbled extracts, construe the Bible to argue and command the slavery of woman, but they stood in a minority and few believed them. Woman's pen was busy, and to her eloquence, as the crowds that gathered to hear Jesse Mario testified, the people were eager to listen. When the venerable lady sat down, there were cheers, hisses, calls for "Lucy Stone," "Rose," Miss Rose," "Greeley," "Phillips," "Garrison," "Smith," and some one in stentorian voice proposed "three cheers for Lucy."

Miss ANTHONY said: "Friends, we have a programme of our own, and you, our guests, I am sure, will be courteous enough to submit to our pleasure while you are here (applause). She introduced Rev. Antoinette Brown Blackwell.

Mrs. BLACKWELL was greeted with long applause, of which the rowdies taking advantage, fell to whistling, drumming, groaning, and cat-calls. Said Mrs B., I will try to be heard, and if I cannot be, I will sit down (cries of "good," "go on," "go in"). There was no divine law, she said, which stamped woman inferior to man, none to hedge out the tree of knowledge from her, and yet, as a class, women were weak and inferior. Our wisest women never were the superiors of our wisest men, even if equal to them. Then she must be either weaker by nature or the deficiency lies in her education, and here lay the difficulty. The laws that oppress women were few, but they disfranchised